





THE DRAWINGS OF THE  
FLORENTINE PAINTERS  
CLASSIFIED CRITICISED AND STUDIED  
AS DOCUMENTS IN THE HISTORY AND  
APPRECIATION OF TUSCAN ART

WITH A COPIOUS CATALOGUE RAISONNÉ

By BERNHARD BERENSON

VOL I

NC  
286  
f5  
B38  
1903  
v.1  
text

LONDON  
JOHN MURRAY ALBEMARLE STREET W  
MCMIII



BALLANTYNE PRESS  
LONDON & EDINBURGH



Cal  
L. 15. 11. 20. 18.

Cal 41  
Nr 7+7

VOL I  
THE DRAWINGS OF THE FLORENTINE PAINTERS  
TEXT

*This Edition is limited to Three Hundred and Fifty-five Copies in all  
(One Hundred and Five for America and Two Hundred and Fifty  
for Great Britain) and the Type has been distributed.*

*This is Number 202.*

#### ERRATA

Vol. I. Plate 1, facing page 2. *For Agnolo Gaddi read Taddeo Gaddi.*

Vol. I. List of Illustrations, page v, line 1. *For Agnolo Gaddi read Taddeo Gaddi.*

# LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

## VOL I

PLATE	No. in Catalogue	To face page	PLATE	No. in Catalogue	To face page
✓ I. Agnolo Gaddi, Louvre . . . . .	758	2	✓ XXXVII. Pesellino, Uffizi . . . . .	1838	154
✓ II. Fra Angelico, British Museum . . . . .	162	6	✓ XXXVIII. Pesellino, Dr. G. Frizzoni, Milan . . . . .	1840	158
✓ III. Fra Angelico, Windsor . . . . .	163	8	✓ XXXIX. Compagno di Pesellino, Berlin . . . . .	670	160
✓ IV. Fra Angelico, Windsor . . . . .	163 verso	16	✓ XL. Botticelli, British Museum . . . . .	567	168
✓ V. Domenico di Michelino, Louvre . . . . .	1752	18	✓ XLI. Botticelli, Uffizi . . . . .	563	178
✓ VI. Benozzo, Dresden . . . . .	532	22	✓ XLII. Botticelli, Uffizi . . . . .	564	182
✓ VII. Benozzo, British Museum . . . . .	540	24	* ✓ XLIII. Botticelli, Uffizi . . . . .	566	184
✓ VIII. Benozzo, Uffizi . . . . .	537	32	✓ XLIV. Botticelli, Uffizi . . . . .	562	192
✓ IX. Benozzo, British Museum . . . . .	542	34	✓ XLV. School of Botticelli, British Museum . . . . .	578	194
✓ X. Pier Francesco Fiorentino, Uffizi . . . . .	1868	38	✓ XLVI. School of Botticelli, Uffizi . . . . .	577	198
✓ XI. Uccello, Uffizi . . . . .	2678	40	✓ XLVII. Giuliano da Sangallo, Siena . . . . .	2472	200
✓ XII. Uccello, Uffizi . . . . .	2675	48	✓ XLVIII. Giuliano da Sangallo, Uffizi . . . . .	2469	208
✓ XIII. A. Pollajuolo, British Museum . . . . .	1905	50	✓ XLIX. Amico di Sandro, Louvre . . . . .	53	210
✓ XIV. A. Pollajuolo, Uffizi . . . . .	1903	54	✓ L. Amico di Sandro, Louvre . . . . .	54	214
✓ XV. A. Pollajuolo, Uffizi . . . . .	1900	56	✓ LI. Amico di Sandro, Uffizi . . . . .	45	216
✓ XVI. A. Pollajuolo, Uffizi . . . . .	1901	64	✓ LII. Amico di Sandro, Berlin . . . . .	44	224
✓ XVII. A. Pollajuolo, Uffizi . . . . .	1902	66	✓ LIII. Sellajo, British Museum . . . . .	2508	226
✓ XVIII. A. Pollajuolo, British Museum . . . . .	1906	70	✓ LIV. Filippino Lippi, Uffizi . . . . .	1285	230
✓ XIX. P. Pollajuolo, Uffizi . . . . .	1952	72	✓ LV. Filippino Lippi, British Museum . . . . .	1344	232
✓ XX. School of Pollajuolo, Hamburg . . . . .	1944	80	✓ LVI. Filippino Lippi, Uffizi . . . . .	1298	240
✓ XXI. School of Pollajuolo, M. Léon Bonnat, Paris . . . . .	1950	90	✓ LVII. Filippino Lippi, Dresden . . . . .	1279	242
✓ XXII. School of Pollajuolo, Christ Church, Oxford . . . . .	1948	94	✓ LVIII. Filippino Lippi, Uffizi . . . . .	1287	246
✓ XXIII. Verrocchio, Louvre . . . . .	2691 <sup>A</sup> verso	96	✓ LIX. Filippino Lippi, Uffizi . . . . .	1315	248
✓ XXIV. Verrocchio, Uffizi . . . . .	2690	104	✓ LX. Garbo, British Museum . . . . .	764	256
✓ XXV. Verrocchio, British Museum . . . . .	2691	106	✓ LXI. Garbo, Christ Church, Oxford . . . . .	768	266
✓ XXVI. School of Verrocchio, British Museum . . . . .	2707	110	✓ LXII. Garbo, Louvre . . . . .	769	270
✓ XXVII. Botticini, British Museum . . . . .	589	112	✓ LXIII. Carli, British Museum . . . . .	640	272
✓ XXVIII. Botticini, British Museum . . . . .	590	120	✓ LXIV. Alunno di Domenico, Uffizi . . . . .	32	280
✓ XXIX. Credi, British Museum . . . . .	691	122	✓ LXV. Baldovinetti, Uffizi 192, 194, 195, 196 . . . . .	282	
✓ XXX. Credi, Louvre . . . . .	709	126	✓ LXVI. Domenico Ghirlandajo, British Museum . . . . .	878	286
✓ XXXI. Credi, Louvre . . . . .	715	128	✓ LXVII. Domenico Ghirlandajo, Windsor . . . . .	893	288
✓ XXXII. Credi, Uffizi . . . . .	686	136	✓ LXVIII. Domenico Ghirlandajo, British Museum . . . . .	881	296
✓ XXXIII. Fra Filippo, Archives, Florence . . . . .	1385	138	✓ LXIX. Domenico Ghirlandajo, Uffizi . . . . .	876	306
✓ XXXIV. Fra Filippo, Hamburg . . . . .	1386	142	✓ LXX. Domenico Ghirlandajo, Munich . . . . .	885	310
✓ XXXV. Fra Filippo, British Museum . . . . .	1387	144	✓ LXXI. Mainardi, Uffizi . . . . .	1392	312
✓ XXXVI. Pesellino, Louvre . . . . .	1841	152	✓ LXXII. David Ghirlandajo, Uffizi . . . . .	797 verso	320





## PREFACE

**I**N sending forth this book, I thank the owners of the collections which have been thrown open to me, and the directors of the various print-rooms. I am peculiarly indebted to Dr. Lippmann, of Berlin, to Mr. Colvin, of the British Museum, to Dr. Meder of the Albertina, and to Signor Nerino Ferri of the Uffizi. Without the friendly zeal of Signor Ferri, scores of drawings under his charge might have escaped my notice.

I trust that I have not failed to make acknowledgments for all helpful suggestions, whether drawn from published works or private communications. But in the friendly intercourse between fellow students one is sometimes at a loss to remember to whom a certain idea first occurred. It is my duty therefore—and it is a pleasure as well—to express my indebtedness to Mr. Herbert P. Horne, and to Hr. Jens Thiis. It was a great gain that I could discuss with the one Botticelli and his circle, and with the other the group of Ghirlandajo, Credi, and Piero di Cosimo.

A word about the plates. They are intended, in the first place, as specimens of Florentine draughtsmanship. Ten times the number would scarcely suffice to illustrate the text.

In the *Catalogue Raisonné* I have ventured to give a consecutive numbering to all the drawings. This may at last get the better of a difficulty that hitherto has been serious. Except of the Albertina at Vienna, and of the University Galleries at Oxford, published catalogues of drawings either do not exist or are very incomplete. There has, therefore, been no way of referring briefly and clearly to a given leaf, and as a makeshift the numbers of Braun's photographs are given. Among many other drawbacks to this course I may cite the fact that but a small part of the material has been photographed by Braun. With a consecutive numbering, any sheet can be referred to in five words, thus, for instance : Berenson, *Florentine Drawings*, No. 758.





# TABLE OF CONTENTS

## CHAPTER I. BEATO ANGELICO AND BENOZZO GOZZOLI :

I. Followers of Giotto . . . . .	Page 1
II. Beato Angelico . . . . .	3
III. Benozzo Gozzoli . . . . .	6
IV. Pier Francesco Fiorentino . . . . .	12
V. Bicci di Lorenzo . . . . .	13

## CHAPTER II. UCCELLO AND THE POLLAJUOLO :

I. Uccello . . . . .	Page 14
II. Castagno . . . . .	16
III. The Pollajuolo, their Paintings . . . . .	17
IV. The Pollajuolo, their Drawings . . . . .	26

## CHAPTER III. VERROCCHIO AND LORENZO DI CREDI :

I. Verrocchio . . . . .	Page 32
II. Conflict of Historic and Æsthetic Interests . . . . .	35
III. Verrocchio's School . . . . .	36
IV. Francesco Botticini . . . . .	40
V. Lorenzo di Credi as Assistant of Verrocchio . . . . .	41
VI. Lorenzo di Credi's Drawings . . . . .	46
VII. "Tommaso" . . . . .	48

## CHAPTER IV. FRA FILIPPO AND BOTTICELLI :

I. Florentine Linealists . . . . .	Page 50
II. Fra Filippo . . . . .	52
III. Fra Diamante . . . . .	53
IV. Pesellino, Compagno di Pesellino and Giusto d'Andrea . . . . .	54
V. Botticelli, Drawings, and Illustrations to Dante . . . . .	60
VI. Botticelli's School . . . . .	66
VII. Giuliano da S. Gallo . . . . .	67
VIII. Amico di Sandro . . . . .	69
IX. Jacopo del Sellajo . . . . .	72

## CHAPTER V. FILIPPINO LIPPI AND RAFFAELLINO DEL GARBO :

I. Filippino Lippi . . . . .	Page 75
II. Raffaellino del Garbo's Paintings . . . . .	80
III. Raffaellino di Carli's Paintings . . . . .	86
IV. Garbo's Drawings . . . . .	95
V. Carli's Drawings . . . . .	98
VI. Alunno di Domenico's Paintings . . . . .	100
VII. Alunno's Drawings . . . . .	107

## CHAPTER VI. THE GHIRLANDAJO, GRANACCI, AND PIERO DI COSIMO :

I. Baldovinetti and Domenico Ghirlandajo . . . . .	Page 109
II. Mainardi and David Ghirlandajo . . . . .	115
III. Ridolfo Ghirlandajo . . . . .	121
IV. Granacci and Raffaele Botticini . . . . .	122
V. Cosimo Rosselli . . . . .	125
VI. Piero di Cosimo . . . . .	127

## CHAPTER VII. FRA BARTOLOMMEO AND HIS FOLLOWING :

I. Fra Bartolommeo, Pen-Drawings . . . . .	Page 133
II. Fra Bartolommeo, Chalk Drawings . . . . .	136
III. List of Principal Works by Fra Bartolommeo for which Drawings exist . . . . .	138
IV. Albertinelli . . . . .	141
V. Fra Paolino . . . . .	143
VI. Sogliani . . . . .	145

## CHAPTER VIII. LEONARDO DA VINCI :

I. Leonardo as a Draughtsman . . . . .	Page 147
II. Origin, Technique, and Imitators . . . . .	148
III. Earliest Sketches, "Madonna del Gatto" . . . . .	150
IV. Adoration of the Magi . . . . .	151
V. "Vierge aux Rochers" . . . . .	153
VI. Sforza Monument . . . . .	154
VII. Last Supper . . . . .	155
VIII. Madonna with St. Anne . . . . .	157

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER VIII—*continued*

ix. Portrait of Isabella d'Este . . . . .	Page 159
x. Battle of the Standard . . . . .	" 161
xi. Studies for a Neptune, a Leda, and a St. Sebastian . . . . .	" 162
xii. Allegories . . . . .	" 163
xiii. Miscellaneous Drawings . . . . .	" 165
xiv. Milanese Followers . . . . .	" 166

## CHAPTER IX. MICHELANGELO :

Introduction . . . . .	Page 167
i. His Instruments . . . . .	" 168
ii. Copies of Giotto and Masaccio . . . . .	" 168
iii. Studies for the Davids, the Bruges Madonna, and the Matthew . . . . .	" 170
iv. The Cartoon for the Bathers . . . . .	" 173
v. Background for the Bathers . . . . .	" 176
vi. The Doni Madonna, and the National Gallery Entombment . . . . .	" 179
vii. The Sixtine Ceiling . . . . .	" 182
viii. The Tomb of Julius . . . . .	" 186
ix. The Christ of the Minerva, and the Medici Tombs . . . . .	" 201
x. Hercules and Antæus, and the Leda . . . . .	" 212
xi. The Cavalieri Designs . . . . .	" 215
xii. The Last Judgment . . . . .	" 219
xiii. Last Phase . . . . .	" 221
xiv. Christ Driving the Money-Changers out of the Temple, and Christ on the Cross . . . . .	" 223
xv. Studies for a Pietà and an Annunciation . . . . .	" 225

CHAPTER X. MICHELANGELO'S IMMEDIATE FOLLOWERS  
AND SUNDRY FORGERS :

Introduction . . . . .	Page 230
i. Sebastiano del Piombo . . . . .	" 231
ii. Andrea di Michelangelo . . . . .	" 245
iii. Silvio Falconi . . . . .	" 249

CHAPTER X—*continued*

iv. Bugiardini . . . . .	Page 249
v. Bandinelli . . . . .	" 251
vi. Antonio Mini . . . . .	" 253
vii. Raffaele da Montelupo . . . . .	" 254
viii. Leonardo Cungi . . . . .	" 263
ix. Battista Franco, Marcello Venusti, and Daniele da Volterra . . . . .	" 264
x. Bartolommeo Passerotti and other Bo- lognese . . . . .	" 265

## CHAPTER XI. ANDREA DEL SARTO AND OTHERS :

i. Andrea's Character as an Artist . . . . .	Page 268
ii. Annunziata Frescoes . . . . .	" 272
iii. Scalzo Frescoes . . . . .	" 275
iv. Last Supper, Tribute to Caesar, "Madonna di Porta à Pinti," and "Madonna del Sacco" . . . . .	" 280
v. Studies for Various Panel Pictures and Portraits . . . . .	" 286
vi. Landscape Drawings ascribed to Andrea; Franciabigio . . . . .	" 296
vii. Puligo . . . . .	" 298
viii. Bacchiacca . . . . .	" 300

## CHAPTER XII. PONTORMO AND ROSSO :

Decline of Art . . . . .	Page 303
i. Pontormo as an Artist . . . . .	" 306
ii. The Lunette at Poggio à Cajano . . . . .	" 308
iii. Pontormo as a Draughtsman, and his Studies for Poggio à Cajano . . . . .	" 312
iv. Pontormo and Dürer; his Studies for the Sta. Felicità altar-piece . . . . .	" 318
v. His Portraits . . . . .	" 322
vi. Studies for his Last Works . . . . .	" 325
vii. Bronzino and Naldini . . . . .	" 327
viii. Rosso . . . . .	" 328

## CHAPTER I

### BEATO ANGELICO AND BENOZZO GOZZOLI

**A**FTER the three centuries that have gone by since Giorgio Vasari wrote, it has become difficult, if not impossible, to find unquestionably authentic drawings by the earliest Florentine Painters. Messer Giorgio possessed a collection which, he believed, included specimens of draughtsmanship by Cimabue and Giotto, by Orcagna and the Gaddi, by Dello Delli and Gherardo Starnina. Yet even in his day, drawings by the early masters had grown so scarce that it was only after great trouble, and at considerable expense, that he could acquire them. Few clear traces of any of these precious remains are now visible. Not only things so subject to every accident as drawings are, but even the more monumental works of some of these earlier painters, have entirely or almost entirely disappeared. Thus, there is not a single painting left that can with certainty be ascribed to Cimabue, and, to apply to one whom we know only as a star in Dante's crystal spheres, the kind of phrase first applied to Dante himself, his fame will ever increase, for no one sees him. Orcagna's renown, no longer sustained by the sublime frescoes of the Pisan Campo Santo, has been confined to a marble tabernacle of questionable perfection, and to the paintings of one chapel, both on panel and wall, the ruins of which have long since been further ruined by the disfiguring hand of the restorer. Starnina and Dello have disappeared, perhaps for ever, into that Hades which awaits the artist whose art completely perishes from off the face of the earth.

If the fruit has been swept clean away, is it any wonder that at an even earlier date the leafage pursued the inevitable course to destruction? Nay, one may even question whether Vasari himself possessed drawings that were really by Cimabue and Giotto. It is possible that the Cimabues he speaks of as half drawn, half illuminated, are the ones now exhibited in the Uffizi; but these tend only to strengthen the opinion which now prevails regarding Vasari as a writer on Cimabue—that he ascribed to this shadowy personage, at once the patriarch, and eponymous hero of early Florentine art, all such paintings and drawings\* as were of a date obviously earlier than Giotto's. It is true there is more of a chance that his Giotto's were genuine; yet I am not without doubt that these also may have

\* Such as are now exhibited in Cornice 1, of the Uffizi.



been of the dubious sort whereof an excellent specimen may be seen in the Uffizi. This pen-and-ink drawing, which may well have belonged to Vasari, is ascribed to Giotto, and represents *The Visitation*. If it were by Giotto, then it would be a study for the fresco in the right transept of the lower church of S. Francesco at Assisi. But it is not by Giotto. The difference in quality between the painting and the drawing is so great that it alone amply suffices to prove a difference in authorship. Cruder proof is, however, not wanting. The pen stroke and the shading betray a Siennese hand, and even the faces have suffered a change from the firm, severe type of Giotto to the comelier and softer beauty of the Siennese. Something more obvious even than this softening, is the change in the hair of the second woman to the spectator's left. In the fresco the hair clings close to the head and is loosely held in by a kerchief. In the drawing it is quite free and combed into wavelets. It is the way of dressing the hair affected by most of the Siennese painters who flourished toward the end of the fourteenth century.

Genuine drawings by Giotto may exist, but it has not been my good fortune to meet with them. The many attributed to him are either by inferior and later hands, besides being seldom, if ever, Florentine; or else, indeed, they are forgeries. Nor has it fared better with the work of his immediate followers. My researches have led me to the conclusion that the Florentine painters of the Trecento are now represented by only one drawing of note. Even that is a mediocre performance by a mediocre artist, Taddeo Gaddi. The sheet in question is in the Louvre, and represents the Virgin going up the steps of the temple. As will be readily seen, it is an elaborate, highly finished study for one of the frescoes in the Baroncelli chapel at Santa Croce in Florence.\* It is, as I have said, no great achievement, but it is not without interest, at least in so far as it tends to place Taddeo somewhat higher in our esteem than the painting itself would permit. The fresco has been freed from the dirt of ages, and renovated with a thoroughness characteristic of a folk which pulled down its inimitable Mercato Vecchio to replace it with a jerry-built Piazza Vittorio Emanuele. The drawing, on the other hand, is comparatively well preserved. But making every allowance for difference of condition, there still remains a difference in quality. In the painting, the figures tend to resemble sacks of sand settling down with their weight. In the drawing they are better modelled, are slimmer, and hold themselves more erect.

The mastery of a Trecentist chiefly reveals itself in the treatment of draperies; for it is by means of the draperies, and by their means only, that he attempted to model the figure and communicate the conviction of its existence. Giotto here attained to a degree of excellence that has never been surpassed, not even by Masaccio or Michelangelo. But his followers from generation to generation† had a dimmer and dimmer understanding of the reason for the selection of certain folds,

\* These frescoes were executed between 1332 and 1338. Vasari (Sansoni) I. 573, note 1.

† In matters of the spirit, the length of a generation should be reduced to ten years at the utmost. It would seem a chief cause for the failure of the so-called "historical criticism" of our times that it either has treated of epochs in the bulk, as Taine and Burckhardt have done, or at the best has marked off evolution into stages of a generation each,

tended more and more to think of them as ready-made patterns, and in obedience to the laws which doom the "successive copying" of a mere design to a further and further departure from the original,\* they ended by doing draperies almost as scrawly and as little expressive of form as were those of Giotto's uncouth precursors.

The decline began with the great master's closest follower, namely with Taddeo Gaddi. Either this painter appreciated nothing in Giotto's splendid forms but their bulk, or, as is likely, he saw more than mere bulk but lacked the skill to convey form. At all events, in most of his paintings, were it not for such obvious tokens of humanity as heads, hands, and feet, and clothing, we should often be puzzled to decide whether a certain shape was meant to represent part of a figure, or a flour-sack; so little, as a rule, did Taddeo understand what he was doing when he drew the folds of his draperies.

The design before us shows him in a phase of exceptional excellence. This may be due to his having taken greater pains, or, as is probable, to his having been trained to express himself better with the pencil than with the brush. At all events, the folds in this sketch are treated far more intelligently than either in the corresponding painting, or elsewhere in Gaddi's works. Look, for instance, at the figures in the foreground. In the sketch, the draperies model the body and limbs which they cover. In the painting, these same figures are not modelled at all, but are formless, now needlessly bulky, and now puffed out like air-cushions.

The drawing is superior even in conception, and shows that Taddeo's earlier, and presumably more spontaneous, feelings were better than thought and elaboration made them afterwards. In the sketch the Virgin, shy and frightened, turns around for encouragement from her people, while in the finished work she seems to harangue them at her leisure.

## II

More diligent research than I have been able to make may succeed in bringing to light interesting drawings by other followers of Giotto, but as I have found little or nothing, we can hasten over the generations until we come to Fra Angelico. When we marshal in memory the score upon score of his works that we have enjoyed, and add to this still living number all those which have perished, we are struck with amazement that, of the countless preparatory studies that Angelico must have made, three or four only have come down to us. Even this trifling

each generation consisting of about thirty years. The absurdity of this method reached its climax in Hennequin, the very man who thus far has made the most vigorous protest against it. He will see no relation of cause and effect between the *Zeitgeist* and the artist; not for many other excellent reasons that might be advanced, but because the same *Zeitgeist* produced an Ariosto and a Tasso. But how could any one suppose that it was the same? As a matter of fact whole generations, in my sense of the word, passed between the periods when these poets were *formed*, and they had scarcely more in common in their beginnings than they had in their art.

\* This phrase is due to Mr. Henry Balfour, and occurs in a passage of his valuable book on "The Evolution of Art." London: Rivington, Percival, & Co., 1893, p. 24. *et seq.* Mr. Balfour's law of successive copying is by no means to be confined to prehistoric art. It applies at least as well to the most recent and advanced schools. It is indeed one of the most far-reaching suggestions ever offered to the student of the evolution of "form."

number would be diminished if we were to talk of an authenticity that no one had a right to question.

The only drawing by Fra Giovanni which leaves no ground for doubt is one in the Malcolm Collection of the British Museum. It represents the youthful David in a sweet ecstasy of song. It seems to have served as a finished illustration for a psalter.\* The modelling is round and soft, the joints are well rendered, the draperies are delicately arranged, the hair is crisp, and full of life. But we note little here that Angelico's paintings have not led us to expect, unless, indeed, it be the curious fact that the line is less continuous and less inevitable. Over the lap, for instance, it is broken, and without much quality of its own. It would seem, therefore, that that subtle movement of line, which is so marked a trait in Angelico's paintings, was not a perfectly spontaneous gift, but a conquest, and that his first thoughts would be put down in lines of no marked quality. This actually is the case with two preparatory sketches—the David is a finished drawing never meant to serve a further purpose—which I believe to be genuine. These are from the master's latest days, and are sketches for the frescoes that Angelico painted for Pope Nicholas V. in the Vatican.

They are on both sides of a sheet at Windsor. On the front is the bust of St. Lawrence, pensive and severe, and so largely, yet so delicately, modelled that, all in all, it almost combines the plastic impressiveness of Donatello, with the large simplicity of the Antique. Technically it is masterly, especially in the use of white.† The drawing on the other side is a more careless effort, a pen sketch. It contains a deacon giving alms, a woman with a child in her arms, and a youth with clasped hands. The deacon is for the St. Lawrence in the fresco where he is giving alms; the woman is for the same work; the youth occurs in a neighbouring fresco, the one representing Lawrence before Decius.

These figures have been used for the paintings with so little change that a comparison between the sketches and finished works must reduce itself to a consideration of their respective qualities. The modelling of the faces and hands is somewhat better in the fresco. On the other hand, the draperies are more functional and better swung in the drawing, and weight and pressure also are more clearly given in the latter. The legs of the youth, for example, are not quite intelligible in the fresco, while, in the drawing, they are well turned, and stand firmly. The draperies of the woman are decidedly more effective in the pen-sketch. But directly we begin to consider the line, the superiority of the painting becomes manifest. Here the lines of the draperies have a flow, a silent speed, which they lack entirely in the sketch, where, on the contrary, they have no beauty of their own, and are as hesitating as the lines over the lap of the David in the Malcolm drawing. Perhaps the finest trait in the Windsor sketch is its admirable pen-stroke in the shading.

\* The reverse contains a portion of the psalms.

† Although doubtless for this series, I cannot find that Angelico did make use of this drawing in the Vatican.



This analysis would tend to establish that Fra Angelico, as an artist in the more specific sense, turned more naturally to form than to line, that he therefore belongs, even if humbly, to the company of Giotto, Masaccio, and Michelangelo, and not to the tradition which produced Lorenzo Monaco, Filippo Lippi, and Sandro Botticelli. It would be hard to understand why Angelico has been so completely misjudged, did we not know that, as a rule, writers have occupied themselves with those elements in an artist's work—elements of mere illustration, now fortunate, and now unhappy—which, artistically, are of the smallest consequence. And people who will see in Fra Angelico nothing but the illustrator, will certainly fail to discern his likeness to Masaccio and Michelangelo.\*

The only other drawings which possibly may be by Fra Angelico are a Christ on the Cross in the Albertina, and a Calling of the Apostles in the His de la Salle Collection of the Louvre. The Albertina design is of exquisite daintiness, and not unworthy of the master. Yet I hesitate to ascribe it to him. It is almost too pretty. The folds on the loin-cloth do not seem quite his, and there are little faults here and there which persuade me that this sheet is more probably by some unknown and very charming imitator. In the other sketch we see two saints kneeling at the Saviour's feet to receive His blessing, while two others look on. It is a delicate and pleasant sketch; but here also I fail to discover the touch of the master. There is quite an attempt to model, and while, in a way, it is well done, it yet results in vague bulk, and in suggesting some one related to Angelico in much the same manner as Taddeo Gaddi was related to Giotto. The draperies are singularly angular; the hair is not indicated as in the more authentic drawings; even the types are not quite Angelico's. I doubt, for instance, whether the master himself would have given Christ such a youthful appearance; or whether he would have drawn heads like the one of the younger kneeling apostle, or of the one on the extreme right.†

These traits of difference from Angelico's certain style—and to them I must add the Saviour's somewhat distorted hands and the long feet of all the figures—remind me of certain paintings generally still ascribed to Angelico, as, for instance, the little Adoration of the Magi in the National Gallery, or the Madonna with Angels formerly in the gallery of S. Maria Nuova and now at the Uffizi, in which, however, one may discern the characteristics of Domenico di Michelino. Why I believe these and many other paintings to be by this well-accredited pupil of Fra Angelico's will, I hope, be fully stated on another occasion. Here I can no more

\* At Munich there is a drawing representing the stoning of Stephen. It seems to have been originally in red chalk, and then to have been gone over with ink. It is a drawing of some value, but not by Angelico I fear. It seems more like a copy after the fresco by some one who already foreshadows Raphael and Fra Bartolommeo, if indeed he was not their follower.—Phot. Bruckmann, No. 136.

† M. de Tausia in his "Notice des Dessins de la Collection His de la Salle," accepting this drawing as a genuine Angelico, expresses the opinion that it may have been for a fresco in the Chapel of Pope Eugene IV. in the Vatican. But if this sketch were genuine, we should have to place it early in Fra Giovanni's career, for the nearest parallels to the close and somewhat angular folds here will be found in the *predelle* of the Gesù at Cortona, or in those of the Perugian altar-piece, now separated from it, and in the Vatican Gallery.

than indicate the connection between the drawing before us and such paintings as I have just mentioned.

The same hand is more readily perceived in a drawing at the British Museum, ascribed somewhat hesitatingly to Fra Angelico. It represents a young warrior saint standing in a niche. The body is not without bulk but is flat and unarticulated in a way Angelico never could have formed it. The folds hang heavy, as if stiffly starched, and are not unlike the folds in the *Calling of the Apostles*. The hair recalls this same sketch. But aside from these minute considerations, the merry twinkle in the eyes, and the general character of the face, and of the carriage, so vividly recall Domenico di Michelino, that they suffice to stamp this pretty drawing as his. We are confirmed in the opinion that this sketch may more safely be attributed to the assistant than to the master, when we examine the back of the leaflet. There we find the study of an elderly grandee on horseback, and two of those clean, fresh heads of youthful monks that Fra Giovanni has scattered through his paintings. The cavalier may actually have been drawn for a *Procession of the Magi* by Domenico Michelino at Strassburg (No. 220). This suggestion will perhaps be protested, because in the picture the knight does not occur, line for line. The likeness is nevertheless of the kind to assure one that both were done by the same hand.

Before passing on to the work of Angelico's most gifted follower, Benozzo Gozzoli, we must give a moment's attention to two or three small drawings in the Uffizi—drawings which are certainly of Angelico's circle, but not to be fathered. The most charming is a sketch for a Madonna and Child, so charming that, were it but better modelled and somewhat better drawn, it might well pass as Angelico's own work. Probably it is a copy by a pupil after an original drawing by the master. Another leaflet contains a saint expounding to three monks, a somewhat scraggly pen-sketch but not without feeling, and also close to the master, but by another hand. A third hand, feeble but dainty, has left faint traces of its existence in two small designs on parchment of medallions containing the figures of Evangelists or Fathers.\*

### III

Benozzo Gozzoli's drawings have hitherto been confounded with those of his master. The old connoisseurship of blessed memory is responsible for this, but it must be confessed that if it had made the attempt to distinguish between the drawings of the two masters it would have found a task to try the severest patience. A singular accident has brought it about that the one or two studies by Fra Angelico that we possess are from his last years, and that the few more noteworthy sketches which, with any degree of certainty, can be ascribed to Benozzo are all from the beginning of his career. Add, that one or two of these are copies by

\* A few more drawings will be found in the catalogue under the rubric "School of Fra Angelico."

Benozzo after works of his master; add that Benozzo has, in his pen drawings, a grace and refinement which he seldom manifests in his paintings, and you will understand the difficulties of deciding whether a given study is by the master or the pupil. Yet to this task we must brace ourselves, and for the first, but, I fear, not at all for the last time, I must crave the reader's indulgence for the heaviness of what he is about to read.

The earliest drawing that we shall consider is one at Chantilly, a somewhat rapid sepia sketch containing a figure of Christ as Judge, three angels, and a separate hand. It is ascribed to Fra Angelico, by whom, at all events, it is not. Let us begin with the more obvious objections. The Christ is too boyish, with a boyishness that, in fact, contradicts his majestic gesture as Judge. In Fra Angelico's authenticated works Christ is always represented as more manly. His draperies, aside from their looseness in handling, have not quite the folds of Angelico. The hand sketched separately, even the Angels, will not be mistaken by a discerning eye for Fra Giovanni's own. In all the points wherein this drawing departs from Angelico's style, it suggests his pupil Benozzo—not the Benozzo of Pisa, I scarcely need add, but Angelico's assistant at Orvieto. Characteristic of Benozzo is the fleeciness of the hair which his master portrays in crisp curls or plastic locks.

Singularly like Gozzoli, too, is this precise exposure of Christ's face, to the right, the tip of the nose almost touching the line of the cheek.\* Peculiar to Benozzo is the inside of the long hand. His also are the folds in the skirts of Christ's mantle, more angular and limp than they would be in Angelico. At the same time, the technique of the drawing—the precise way of using bistre, of putting in the features—is Benozzo's.

But is this drawing an original by even Benozzo? The first impression is not too favourable. In the looseness of the Saviour's mantle there would seem to be an indication of a more careless touch. The quality of line is not what it might be. On the other hand, the inside of the palm is drawn with great precision, and the draperies everywhere are well understood. May it not be Benozzo, then, but more slovenly than in his best drawings, for the simple reason that here he is not inventing, but freely, and perhaps hastily, copying?

For we must admit one of two alternatives: either the Chantilly drawing is the copy by Benozzo of an original sketch by Angelico, or it is the sketch by Benozzo for an important work always ascribed to Angelico, for which he should have, at the very least, furnished the sketches.† I refer to that triangular ceiling fresco in the Capella di S. Brizio of the Orvietan Cathedral, wherein we behold Christ as

\* For many examples look at the Montefalco frescoes (finished 1452) particularly at the one photographed by Alinari under No. 5426.

† Interesting in this connection is the following item from the contract between Fra Giovanni and the *operai* of Orvieto: "*Item quod d. mag. fr. Fohes., interdum fiunt pontes, faciat designum picturarum et figurarum quas debet pingere in volta d. capelle.*" V. Marchese, *Memorie dei più insigni Pittori, Scultori e Architetti Domenicani*, second edition, I, p. 402.



Judge in the midst of angels. It will be readily seen that, despite all differences, the Christ in the drawing is the Christ in the painting, for in Angelico's other pictures of the Judgment the Saviour holds no globe, and his mantle does not sweep out in a large fold from the hip. The angel with the trumpet occurs with scarcely a change in the right corner of the fresco. The kneeling angel may be found with slight variations twice in the painting. The other angel was not used.

Now a careful examination of the fresco reveals that it was painted for the greater part by Benozzo. The Christ, for instance, although he has won much in majesty, has Benozzo's bizarre face with heavy-lidded eyes. What should be the drapery over his chest is nothing but a series of straight lines drawn on a flat surface. As for the angels on the left, they surely are nearer to Gozzoli's at Montefalco, nearer to those even in the Riccardi Chapel at Florence, than to any of Angelico's. On the right, one or two of the heads may just possibly have been by Angelico himself.

The execution of this fresco must pass, then, as almost entirely, if not entirely, Benozzo's.\* But it is scarcely credible that his master did not furnish the sketches, at all events in more primary form;† for that they could not have been complete cartoons we conclude from the circumstance that the faces are so much more characteristic of the pupil than of the master. Furthermore the contract between the Vestry of Orvieto and Angelico stipulates that on the following day he should begin to make the drawings. What doubts still linger in one's mind regarding the authorship of these figures are nearly dispelled by the sketch we find on the verso of the same leaflet. There we find the portrait head of a monk, done in a way which permits one to state with conviction that it is by Benozzo. Somewhat less to our purpose, but of great interest in itself, is the iconography of this face. If I mistake not it is Fra Angelico's as we know it from his tomb relief in the Minerva at Rome.

The figures, then, on this sheet must be copies by Benozzo after jottings by Fra Angelico. They were probably made as notes for future use. It is true that no trace of their use can be discovered among Benozzo's other still existing works, but it surely may be assumed that Gozzoli kept a sketch-book in which he jotted down, after the master, things that might be of service later. Otherwise how explain such striking resemblances between certain compositions of Angelico and others of the pupil? Memory would be sorely taxed to bear away so much detail.

\* I strongly suspect that the reason for this, as well as for Angelico's not going on with the frescoes, was the master's physical discomfort in painting a ceiling, and his fear of the height. It should be remembered that in 1447 he was sixty years old. As has been suggested by various writers, the fall from the scaffolding of one of his assistants seems to have frightened him.

† We know for a certainty that drawings were made by Angelico for one half of the ceiling, as appears from the following document of Nov. 25, 1499: "Mag. Lucas de Cortona, honorabilis pictor fuit conductus ad pingendum et finiendum Capellam novam Ecclesie sancte Marie Majoris urbis veteris cuius dicte Cappelle nove medietas habebat designum iam datum per ven. virum fr. Johannem qui incepit pingere dictam Cappellam novam," &c. A Rossi, *Spogli Vaticani*, in *Giornale d'Erudizione Artistica*, VI., p. 160. Reprinted also in Fumi's *Duomo d'Orvieto*, p. 408.



A striking instance is Benozzo's ceiling in the Chapel of S. Jerome in the Church of S. Francesco at Montefalco.

This ceiling contains in its four triangles the figures of the Evangelists, and varies but in style, and in trifling detail, from the ceiling by Fra Angelico in the chapel of Nicolas V. at the Vatican. Benozzo painted his Evangelists in 1452, and the precise date of Angelico's is unknown, but they may have been begun as early as the autumn of 1447, when Angelico returned from Orvieto. As the ceiling was almost always painted first, and as Benozzo apparently did not leave his master for good before the summer of 1449, it is more than probable that he saw the ceiling of Pope Nicolas' chapel, or at least the drawings for it. But if he made copies, it must have been not of the whole but of the single figures, for in his arrangement\* the Evangelists do not follow each other in the order that Angelico gave them; and as the change has no designable reason, it can be due only to a lack of notes and of memory.

In this connection it is interesting to study two drawings on both sides of the same leaf, also at Chantilly, and also ascribed to Fra Angelico. One of them is for the St. John, and the other for that figure which has undergone the least change from the Vatican to the Montefalco ceiling—the Evangelist Mark. I will attempt to prove that these figures are not by Fra Angelico, and that they are by Benozzo, and copies of the kind that we found in the sketch for the Orvietan fresco of Christ as Judge.

Confining ourselves for convenience to the Mark (seeing that what applies to the one applies to the other), we note that the differences between this Evangelist and Fra Giovanni's painting are of the sort to establish that it is a copy, not after the fresco, but after the original study for it. In the one, Mark is reading, in the other writing; in the one he has his halo and his lion, in the other, not. The clouds indicated in the sketch prove almost conclusively that it was for this ceiling fresco, and not a study for a composition, where Mark would not be alone.

This figure was certainly used by Benozzo for his Montefalco ceiling. In all those points where it differs from Angelico's, this St. Mark coincides with Benozzo's. In the study, as well as in Benozzo's painting, the Evangelist is reading and not writing; in both, and not in Angelico, his beard is divided, and his moustachios are twisted, while only two locks fall down from his head; in both again, and not in Angelico, the mantle of the saint is held over the shoulder; and in both a long crease goes down the length of the right sleeve. This last peculiarity is something so slight that I venture to believe no one would have reproduced it without the design in his hand.

It must be granted, then, that Benozzo used this drawing for his fresco, but this fact alone does not prove that it was his handiwork and not his master's. The height of the cranium, however, the peculiarly monkish poise of the head, the heavy lids, the firm nose, and especially the drapery, which has less sweep and

\* See Alinari's photographs 7498 and 5459.

more angularity than Fra Angelico's, are so many sign-marks of Benozzo's hand. Only here he actually is copying the master, while still under him, and remains much closer to him than in the Montefalco fresco, where he is copying his own copy, at a time when he already was fast falling into mannerisms, or, if you will, into a style of his own.

In the two leaflets which we have just discussed, the task of distinguishing between the master and the pupil has been aggravated by the fact that the latter was copying the former. But at the best it is not easy to separate their work, or the splendid sheet containing St. Michael and a *putto* would not be attributed to Fra Giovanni in such a collection as the one at Dresden. It can, however, be securely ascribed to the young Benozzo. Charming as it is in feeling, it has not the charm of Angelico, but something nearer to earth. St. Michael has a touch even of Filippo Lippi's roguishness. Neither he nor the *putto* have the elect type, the maidenly daintiness of Fra Giovanni's figures. The *putto*, indeed, is in structure realistic to a degree that might perhaps have shocked the saintly Frate.\* The hair on both the heads is fleecy, as Benozzo nearly always in his earlier years preferred it. Nor perhaps would Angelico have been wholly pleased with the quality of the draughtsmanship. The draperies do not really drape, but are almost flat. The left leg of the *putto* could have been drawn much better. The line, it is true, is dainty, but is of another quality from that of the greater master.

At last we come to sketches by Benozzo which are not attributed to Angelico, although until very recently they, with one or two exceptions, did not bear Gozzoli's name either. They are two, one at Dresden, and the other at the British Museum, and are companion sketches for some cycle of paintings touching which we know nothing further. At Dresden it is a girl saint who is being received into an Order. In the British Museum the same saint is in bed, surrounded by her friends, while she beholds a vision of the Madonna and Angels. Very likely we have here sketches for the first and last striking episodes either in the life of St. Clare of Assisi, or possibly of that other Clare, of Montefalco, whose shadowy legend was like a blurred tracing after that of her more glorious namesake.† The story of either would have been a favourite subject for painting in Umbria, and the style of the sketches points to the Umbrian period of Benozzo's career.‡

In these two drawings we see Gozzoli perhaps at his best. He already is

\* See the various children in the Montefalco frescoes.

† They certainly could not have served for the Viterbo frescoes of 1453. These were destroyed in 1632, but copies were then made, and although they are poor enough, they enable one to see what the compositions were like. "Descrizione di nove storie di S. Rosa," &c. Viterbo, Tipografia Pompei, 1872.

‡ The porch under which St. Clare is being received is supported on slender columns, the capitals of which are almost identical with those in the fresco at Montefalco where St. Francis is seen walking through the fire. This is perhaps as strong a single proof as one could find not only for identity of authorship, but for identity of period. Another detail, already noted as most peculiar to Benozzo, is the vertical crease of the sleeve of the monk receiving the saint. Further proof that these drawings are by Benozzo could be piled up, but only *ad nauseam* of the competent student.

himself, and there is as yet no trace of the slovenliness and bad taste into which he falls later. He tells his story with the charm of a Carpaccio, and with the dainty distinction of a Pesellino. Indeed, I question how few of us would have hesitated to ascribe to Pesellino himself the youth on the extreme right in the British Museum drawing, if we had this figure alone. The line is exquisite, and functional. The draperies are treated with full understanding of their purpose. Then there is an indefinable beauty in the mere penmanship which we shall see rivalled but seldom. In none of his paintings, neither in the Riccardi chapel, nor even in his best frescoes at Montefalco, does Benozzo so much as suggest the great master. But these little sketches would seem to belong to a talent superior to Fra Filippo's, and not inferior to Pesellino's, a talent which nevertheless painted little that can be placed on a level with the works of either of these masters, and much that does not quite out-dazzle Cosimo Rosselli's achievements. If even Donatello felt that, away from the biting criticism of his friends at Florence, he tended to get rusty, how much more did Benozzo need that criticism! But he received only the flattery of provincials, and lived to crowd *pêle mêle* the walls of the Pisan Campo Santo.

These two drawings would seem to have been finished designs made on a small scale to show, perhaps, to his employers. For domestic purposes he probably drew more carelessly, as would appear from a small fragment in the Uffizi wherein we see rapidly sketched with the pen a cardinal and a young follower. These served for the fresco in S. Francesco at Montefalco where we see S. Jerome and an acolyte leaving behind them the walls of a town.\* In the painting the two figures were brought closer, the cardinal's hat thrown more to the left, and in consequence Jerome's hands were slightly rearranged. From these changes it would seem that, when the sketch was made, Benozzo had not yet settled upon the exact lines of the background. It is these which necessitated the alterations.

The subtle pen-sketch of two youths in the Malcolm Collection need not detain us, nor the less subtle but still beautiful one belonging to Mr. Loeser of Florence.† We should learn from them nothing new. Still less need we linger over one or two sketches in bistre and white at the Uffizi, or over the Malcolm design for a Presentation of the Virgin, for they are fully discussed in the appended catalogue. To Benozzo's later years may belong a drawing in bistre and white in the Uffizi, representing Christ on the cross, and the young Evangelist. The types are unmistakable, but the quality is far from satisfactory. The nude is poor, yet that need perhaps not surprise us in a pupil of Fra Angelico. Christ's arms are as lifeless as sawed boards. But just here, and more or less throughout, the drawing has been retouched, and the figure of John, which is better preserved,

\* Photo. Alinari 5463.

† More important than either is the splendid but unfortunately blackened drawing for a Madonna and Saints in the Dyce Collection of the South Kensington Museum. Here Benozzo is in all his charm, and attains to a spirit and freedom of touch which place him as a draughtsman somewhere close to Carpaccio.



is certainly of finer quality than the rest. Note, for instance, the difference between his limbs and those of Christ. Retouching may also account for the tameness of the outlines.

## IV

Drawings of Benozzo's school are rare, and, as a rule, unimportant. A few of the least unworthy will be found in the catalogue. Two or three ascribed to Gozzoli himself are by a hand that made a number of sketches, most of them in the Uffizi, where in great part they are catalogued as "Unknown Fifteenth Century." They nearly all are drawn with the pen in curiously black but feeble outline, with an addition of white, on brownish paper. Although in type and attitude they betray Sienese and even Umbrian influences, they clearly were done by some painter who had learned under Benozzo Gozzoli.

Now the most striking feature in this series of sketches is the system of folds. They are Benozzesque, but in a way which suggests that the draughtsman had never realised that drapery should help to model, should, in short, be functional. He arranges the folds as flat as if he had laid them down with limp, wet string. When we look closer, we note that this tendency to flatten all bosses and modelling into mere silhouettes invades his flesh parts as well. He must have been, therefore, a painter who never could have looked at nature but learned what he did by copying others—in these drawings chiefly Benozzo.

Well, there exists a series of pictures which despite the greatest diversity in type, in arrangement, and idea, yet in colour, to some degree in landscape, but chiefly in the flat, unfunctional treatment of the draperies, reveals the same hand. I am convinced that that hand was Pier Francesco Fiorentino's. He was until the other day quite unknown, but recently the late Signor Cavalcaselle in vol. vii. of his "*Storia della Pittura Italiana*" has given an account of this Florentine's pictures in and near S. Gimignano. In the second edition of my "*Florentine Painters*" I have given a long but still incomplete list of the same artist's pictures everywhere. I thus can dispense with many words concerning him here. Suffice it that he had great technical ability, a wonderfully decorative sense of colour, and almost no invention. When not copying Fra Filippo, or Pesellino, or Baldovinetti, he was happy, in his better moods, to jumble these various masters together, and, in less felicitous moments, to fall back on his early acquisitions under Benozzo and Neri di Bicci. Credit is due to him, nevertheless, for having known his talents and known his failings. By copying greater masters in a technique at times far more agreeable than their own, he attains to an excellence which makes these pictures a joy to the eye, whereas, when he ventured upon original composition, he shared the fate of many another clod-hopping Icarus.

As I have said, even more than colour and landscape, his flat, unfunctional draperies unmask Pier Francesco under his various disguises. But this precise



system of flat folds characterises the drawings we are discussing. Other items of likeness are not wanting, but they are minute, and I shall let the student have the joy of discovering them for himself. One point is still to be made. We have noted that these drawings betray the pupil of Benozzo who came under Sienese and even Umbrian influences. Pier Francesco suits the case. He was a follower of Benozzo's ; he could resist no influence ; at S. Gimignano, where he spent the last thirty years of the fifteenth century, he not only could contemplate many Sienese works, but was near to Siena, where he could study many more, and get acquainted with specimens of Umbrian painting as well.

The series of sketches catalogued in this book under Pier Francesco Fiorentino's name are certainly by one and the same hand ; and after what has just been said, it becomes highly probable that it was his hand.

## V

In the University Galleries at Oxford there is an excellent sketch for a bust portrait of a middle-aged, sharp-featured Florentine, seen in profile to left. It is ascribed to Uccello, by whom it certainly is not. The handling connects it with the circle, although not necessarily with the school, of Fra Angelico. As for the conception and even the type of face, they both vividly remind us of certain heads in Bicci di Lorenzo's fresco on the façade of S. Maria Nuova, painted in 1424, and representing the consecration of that church by Martin V. four years earlier. That work is now almost invisible under the grime of the glass meant to preserve it, and accurate inspection of it is rendered very difficult, if not impossible. Perhaps, if one could study each figure separately, one might find the head for which this sketch served. We shall at all events not go far astray if we provisionally catalogue this not very powerful but delicate and well rendered drawing as Bicci di Lorenzo's. I must, however, warn the student that against this attribution we have the circumstance that there is no identity between the writing on this leaflet, and Bicci's hand in the only specimen known to me, the one reproduced in Pini and Milanesi's "*Scrittura di Artisti Italiani*."\*

\* It should be observed, on the other hand, that the specimens reproduced in this work are not necessarily autograph. I am indebted for this warning to Mr. Horne.

## CHAPTER II

### UCCELLO AND THE POLLAJUOLO

IT may be taken for granted that drawings by Masolino and Masaccio had by Vasari's time become very rare, or Messer Giorgio certainly would have claimed the possession of examples. His famous *Libro* seems to have guarded no such treasures. Time since Vasari has not yielded up any authentic sketches by these founders of Florentine Quattrocento painting, although hundreds are ascribed to them in the various collections of Europe. It has fared somewhat better with the greatest of Masolino's and Masaccio's immediate contemporaries, Paolo Uccello. From his descendants Vasari had it that their ancestor had left behind him chests full of drawings. Their number has been greatly reduced—so far as I know, to four or five. Fortunately three are important, and two of them are masterpieces. All are in the Uffizi.

The date of one of them is so well known that this additional interest naturally gives it the first place in our attention, although in quality it is the least interesting. This is the sketch for the equestrian portrait in *verde terra* of Sir John Hawkwood, painted in the summer of 1436, for the Cathedral of Florence. It is done in greenish wash and heightened with white on a background coloured purple. It is in a lamentable condition, and is now of small value. In its original state it probably differed in no detail from the fresco, and at present, far from throwing any light on the genesis of that work, it needs the painting for its interpretation. Only in the lines of the horse's tail is there still a quality of movement that reveals the master. That aside, it has no artistic interest whatever.

Another of these drawings is also of a horseman, but not at all the tame performance that John Hawkwood is. It is, on the contrary, one of the most spirited and splendid achievements of the Florentine School. Merely as an impression of colour, with its turquoise ground, its outlines in silver-point, and its telling touches of white, it is flower-like and caressing to the eye, and worthy of Uccello in the mood when he created such a masterpiece of decorative colour as his battle-piece in the National Gallery. On this pleasant background we see, mounted on a richly caparisoned horse and charging at full speed, a knight, encased from his massive helmet to his pointed toes in the gorgeous armour of

the sunset-time of chivalry. As you look, you sit firmly with the knight, you dash forward joyfully with the charger.

Regarded as a whole, the movement in this sketch is communicated admirably, the pressures and strains being everywhere clearly indicated. In detail, however, satisfaction is not quite so complete. The line has nowhere that rush, as line, which would be all the more enhancing to a subject treating sustained action. It has something of that timidity, that apathy which at times surprises us in Uccello's greater successor in the field of Naturalism, Pollajuolo.

This drawing has been squared out for enlarging, but its precise counterpart does not occur where we should expect it, in any of those three battle-pieces,\* still extant, originally painted for the Casa Medici.† Perhaps if the Bartolini frescoes had survived, we should find it there. As it is, we see in the National Gallery panel more than one group of horse and rider almost like this sketch. Closest in resemblance is the knight seen in the second rank charging ahead of Tolentino. But all the horses are of the same breed as in the drawing, and all are caparisoned in the same way; and the armour is of the same fashion. We may safely assume that, if the figure for which this sketch served did not occur in the perished Bartolini paintings, it was made for yet another work of the same kind and style.‡

Still superior to the sketch of the knight is the third of Uccello's drawings in the Uffizi, this time a portrait. Relieved against a dark brown surface we see, washed in with bistre on a white ground, the profile of an iron-tempered master of life. It has not been easy for him to win the prize away from his many rivals, and in the struggle his forehead has over-beetled his face, and his underlip has curled down as if to meet his chin; but he has remained master—and with the loss of such a trifle as a name, master he still is. Neither reality nor art do at any time offer in plenty types so life-enhancing by the vigour of their being. It must be confessed, he was lucky to find an Uccello to portray him. You may wander through all the precincts of Renaissance painting without finding a work superior to this profile in any quality that is essential to the masterpiece. In directness of conception, in the force of its modelling, it not only anticipates but stands perhaps at the head of all the many profile portraits that were painted in Florence for generations after Uccello. How one feels here the firmness of the osseous structure, the elasticity of the flesh, and the stretch of the skin! What life in the eye and nostrils! There is only one other work of art that has the precise qualities of this head, and that is the splendid profile of a Medici lady in the National Gallery, there still attributed to Piero dei Franceschi, but more probably

\* Florence, Uffizi, No. 52. London, National Gallery, No. 583. Paris, Louvre, No. 1273.

† See Mr. Herbert P. Horne's article in the *Monthly Review*, Oct. 1901, where for the first time is determined what these pieces represent and for whom they were painted.

‡ There recently was in the possession of Signor Bardini, at Florence, a ruined picture of *St. George and the Dragon* by Uccello, in which the horseman had considerable, but again not complete, resemblance to this drawing. Since the above was written, this panel has entered the collection of Mme. Edouard André of Paris.

by Paolo Uccello.\* And the masterly use of bistre in the drawing goes a great way to suggest and to supply the fascinating colour of the painting.†

## II

We noted in the drawing of the knight on horseback a resemblance in quality to the work of Pollajuolo. The likeness is not accidental, for this most gifted of the Florentine Naturalists derived his art from Uccello, the founder of the sect. The derivation, however, was not immediate, but through Andrea del Castagno. We never can have more than a fragmentary acquaintance with this highly gifted and most powerful artist; for the few paintings by him still remaining are all from his last years, and tell us little about his origin. This much, however, is clear: That he was strongly influenced by Uccello, and that he, in turn, exerted an even stronger influence on Pollajuolo. Indeed, we still find under the latter's name such capital achievements of Castagno as the shield painted with the graceful figure of a David belonging to Mr. Drury Lowe of Locko Park,‡ or the splendid portrait of a Florentine, which passed the other day from the Torrigiani Collection into the hands of M. Rodolphe Kann of Paris.

There is no lack of drawings going under Castagno's name, but I fail to read their title. Nor are genuine drawings of his school at all common. In the Uffizi there are, however, a number of sketches of figures and draperies which betray a spirited if coarse hand, and reveal a follower to whom more than a little of superannuated Giottesque tradition still adhered. As there are more than a few traces of writing on these leaflets, all in the Uffizi by the way, it is by no means improbable that through this medium we shall some day discover the name of this follower. Meanwhile I would suggest that he was the author of the fresco which, detached from the wall upon which it was painted, may now be seen in the refectory of S. Croce. In that fresco we see a large figure of S. Eustace and around it small scenes from that saint's legend. The draperies, and the curious mingling of Giottesque survivals with Castagno's mannerisms, are singularly like the drawings in question. Moreover, this fresco is dated 1467, and on one of the drawings there is a memorandum bearing the same date.

But to return to greater things, nowhere does the closeness of the connection between Castagno and Pollajuolo reveal itself more clearly than in a drawing at the Albertina, in Vienna. There it was ascribed to Lazzaro Vasari, but Prof. Wickhoff gave it to Castagno. I am sure he was mistaken; nevertheless this attribution

\* Dr. J. P. Richter was the first to restore this portrait to its author.

† In the Albertina there is an old copy of another head, good enough as a copy to show how fine the original must have been. This doubtless was for a portrait in the character of the young man pointing, in the *Drunkenness of Noah*, at S. Maria Novella.

‡ Reproduced as Pollajuolo's in Dr. J. P. Richter's "Catalogue of Pictures at Locko Park." London, Bemrose and Sons.



put the problem on the road to a solution. In this sketch we see two men wearing the high flat-topped hats affected by the Byzantine delegates to the Council of Florence. The vehemence of the pose and action, and the determined look, do indeed vividly recall Castagno. Nevertheless these figures have a keenness and refinement which surpass that great master, while the well-hung draperies, the large modelling, the sure and firm penstroke, and the very pictorial use of wash, point unmistakably to Antonio Pollajuolo. To be more explicit, note the resemblance of the face to that of the Hercules in the little Uffizi picture. The predatory hands, and the almost diagonal parallel folds are not to be matched at all so closely in Castagno as in Antonio, in such unquestionable works of his as, for instance, the embroideries in the Opera del Duomo. The original designs for these masterpieces have disappeared, but Herr von Beckerath possesses an excellent school copy of the one for *The Preaching of the Baptist*. Making allowance for the inevitable difference in quality between an original and a copy, observe the identity in a score of points between this and the Albertina figures, but particularly in handling and technique.\*

It is my intention in this work to confine myself as strictly as may be to a discussion of the drawings, and the drawings only, of the Florentine painters, and to avoid other considerations both general and particular. It must be remembered, however, that the drawing, which in the natural order of things preceded the painting, now can be judged only according to canons derived from a study of finished works. Where a certain agreement prevails regarding these works, our special task takes them for granted, and hastens about its own business. Where, however, confusion takes the place of relative certainty, and attribution makes its wildest guesses, we lack the elements wherewith to build up acquaintance with a master's style, or to form an appreciation of his quality. Before proceeding therefore with our examination of the more interesting drawings ascribed to Pollajuolo, we shall do well to try first to form a more adequate notion of his artistic personality and his relation to his brother Piero than has hitherto prevailed.

### III

Few things, at first thought, can be more surprising than that criticism should still be helpless before the Pollajuolo: the problem would not seem hopeless; for we have a number of sculptures, a still greater number of embroideries faithfully executed on his designs, and one painting by Antonio of undisputed authenticity, as well as one large picture by Piero, signed and dated. Nor would the confusing

\* As may be inferred from the existence of two copies evidently after Pollajuolo, one of three figures similar to those in the Albertina, but with the addition of the young King [Uffizi, 2299], and the other of the eldest King prostrate at the Child's feet [Uffizi, 369], our sketch most likely served as a study for figures in a train of Magi for a low rectangular Adoration.

of the two brothers—a matter to which we shall return presently—account for the great difficulty. It can be nothing but insufficient study that could have led critics to attribute to the Pollajuolo not only paintings by Botticelli\* and Botticini† and Castagno,‡ but works of such distinctly Venetian character as Jacopo di Barbari's St. Sebastian in the Pitti,§ or the frescoes in the Palazzo Venezia at Rome, possibly by Girolamo da Treviso the Elder, representing the Labours of Hercules.||

These more flagrant errors of contemporary criticism happily are soon swept away, nor is it a great task to brush aside certain absurd ascriptions of Vasari's. A serious critic nowadays would, I trust, not think of ascribing to either of the Pollajuolo the frescoes and the Annunciation of the Portuguese chapel at S. Miniato. We encounter real difficulty only when we attempt to ascertain what was the share of each of the brothers in the paintings that one or the other of them certainly executed.

I have said the problem should not be insoluble, and I venture to say much can be done towards a solution. The trouble seems to be that the problem has never been properly approached.

The error has its source in Vasari, and springs from the temperament of Messer Giorgio and the character of his work. He was an indifferent connoisseur and a poor historian; but he was a great appreciator—the greatest Italian Art has ever found—and a passionate anecdote-monger. Now the anecdote must have sharp contrasts, and, if they are wanting, they must be invented. As a matter of fact, Antonio Pollajuolo seems to have been a painter his life long, as well as a sculptor.¶ But as this offers no point for a good story, Antonio was made to turn

\* The St. Sebastian at Berlin.

† Messrs. Crowe and Cavalcaselle's attribution of the Three Archangels in Florence Academy, and an altar-piece in the Capponi Chapel of Santo Spirito in Florence.

‡ The male portrait formerly in the Torrigiani Collection at Florence.

§ See my "Lorenzo Lotto," p. 32.

|| An attribution made by the late Dr. Ulmann. In an article in the "Jahrbücher der Preussischen Kunstsammlungen" for 1894, the same writer has attempted to decide what works are by the Pollajuolo, and how they are to be distributed between the two brothers. But his erudition and patient research were vitiated by a sense for quality only sporadic, or at the best, intermittent.

¶ This is brought out with sufficient clearness by Dr. Ulmann in the article mentioned. To what he there says may be added that Antonio's name, as my friend Mr. Herbert P. Horne kindly communicated to me, is found at the head of the list in the books of the *painters'* guild, drawn up in 1472.

As for Vasari, I am more than aware that he personally invented but little, and merely picked up the gossip that was afloat, but it was his stamp which gave it currency. The source of the whole trouble may be traced back to the bad verses, "De pictoribus et sculptoribus Florentinis," of Ugolino Verini (reprinted in "Festschrift zu Ehren des Kunsthistorischen Instituts in Florenz," Leipzig, A. G. Liebeskind, 1897), where the rhetorical craving for epigram, and the exigencies of versification pushed the poetaster to contrast sharply, but with reference neither to facts nor to criticism, the occupations of the two brothers. How little Verini expected to be taken in earnest we shall see if we compare the statements and estimates he made in the epigrams to which I have referred, the manuscript of which, by the way, is dated 1491, with what he has to say on the same subject in his "De Illustratione Urbis Florentiæ." Here (Book II.) he says:

*Nec Pulli Fratres ornandi laude minore.  
Clarior at fuso longe est Antonius aere.*

In the epigram this simple statement takes on a very different colour:

*Sunt gemini insignes Pullo cognomine fratres,  
Quorum alter pictor! scultor uterque bonus  
Spirantes fundit vultus Antonius aere  
Signaque de molli vivida fingit humo!*

deliberately and suddenly from the one art to the other,\* spurred on, if you please, by the desire for glory, work in bronze having been discovered to be so much more perishable than work with the brush!

This story would have remained perhaps harmless, if Vasari had not gone further, and declared that, at the late date in life when Antonio turned to painting,\* he learned the craft from his brother Piero. Then the mischief was done. In vain does he expressly tell us that even in painting Antonio soon surpassed his younger brother. It is in vain also that he ascribes most of the important pictures to the same elder brother. Modern criticism inevitably follows the momentum his tale gave it, and ascribes most of the Pollajuolo paintings to Piero.

I repeat that general discussions of artistic personality and character should properly form no part of my present task, and it is with great reluctance that I enter upon it in the case of the Pollajuolo. But we are dealing with the draughtsman believed both by Lorenzo the Magnificent,† by Cellini and Vasari to have been the greatest of his day; and as we can acquire no criteria for the sifting of Antonio's drawings without having previously established his character upon the study of his finished works, we must in the first place turn to these, if we would decide which drawings are his, and which his brother's.

I already have mentioned what data we have for a decision. In the case of Antonio we have not only the sculptures, undisputably his, and the little paintings of Hercules and Antaeus, and Hercules and the Hydra [Uffizi, 1153] universally accepted as his, but the engraving representing the Combat of the Nudes signed by him, and the twenty-seven embroideries recounting the life of the Baptist, executed with such perfection after his designs that, as Vasari observes, you seem to perceive not the embroiderer's needle but the master's very touch. All these works bear out, and more than bear out, the reputation Antonio enjoyed among his contemporaries and their descendants. They reveal him as one of the greatest masters of movement that there ever has been, one of the ablest interpreters of the human body as a vehicle of life-communicating energy and exulting power. Against this magnificent achievement of his elder brother, Piero has nothing to offer in the way of perfectly authenticated works but the S. Gimignano altar-piece. It is a picture of unalloyed mediocrity, with scarcely a touch of charm to repay the absence of life and vigour.

Piero was forty when he painted this picture, dated 1483. He was in the maturity of his years therefore, and doubtless at the height of his powers. We

The same exaggeration appears throughout in the epigrammatic as compared with the epic version, but the estimates vary. Filippino, for instance, who must certainly have been a friend of Verini's, is placed far too high in the "Illustratio," where, nevertheless, Leonardo is given the first rank. In the Epigram Filippino is addressed as "*primum dignus habere locum!*"

\* As a matter of fact, Antonio, as we shall see presently, must have painted much more in the earlier part of his career than later, when his energies were devoted to the tombs of Sixtus IV. and Innocent VIII. It was the fame of these undertakings, and his absence from Florence, which made it possible for tradition regarding the nature of his activities to become at first vague, and then to fix upon the last phase as characteristic of his whole career.

† On Nov. 12, 1489, Lorenzo wrote to Giov. Lanfredini, Florentine envoy at Rome: "Detto Antonio è il principale Maestro di questa Città, e forse per avventura non ce ne fu mai; e questa è commune opinione di tutti gl'intendenti." Gaye, Carteggio I. 341.



shall do him no injustice, then, if we take it for granted that it represents him well, and that we may study it as a characteristic specimen of his style.

To begin with, we are struck with the blond tone of the entire surface, and note how different it is from the deep brown of Antonio's one undisputed painting. It is more or less the tone of colour that we find in the works of Domenico Veneziano and his followers, Piero dei Franceschi, and Alessio Baldovinetti. But the contrasts of light and shade are far cruder than in these masters, and seem to point to an artist accustomed to the study, not so much of nature as of marbles or bronzes. Then the types, although close enough to Antonio's, are yet different. The oval is rounder, and the face is chubbier. The features are somewhat pinched. The eyes tend to project, and the lids are heavy. Furthermore the hands are larger than Antonio's, and less cramped with nervous energy. The draperies differ but little in pattern from Antonio's, and yet are more flowing, and less angular.

At San Gimignano we see how Piero expressed himself as an artist in those years which, if he followed the course of most other mortals, must have been his best. Three and twenty years before this time his elder brother, then aged thirty-one, painted for the Medici three of the Combats of Hercules.\* The large works have perished, but the original small versions of two of the combats still exist [Uffizi, 1153], and are, in fact, the only paintings that pass undisputed as Antonio's own.† I need not expatiate upon their beauty, for to the intelligent, few works of art are better known; but I would ask whether there could be a greater gulf than exists between these authenticated works of the two brothers, whether two other works of art could better point the difference between genius and mediocrity.

The pictures we have just been considering prove more than that Antonio and Piero could not have been rivals; they prove the absurdity of Vasari's statement that Antonio learnt the craft of painting from his younger brother. Antonio declares expressly that he and Piero executed the Combats of Hercules in 1460. On the most probable calculation, Piero could at this time have been but seventeen years old. This turns the tables. Surely no one will think of making Piero at seventeen the important member in a partnership. At that age, even were he the man of genius, and his brother of thirty-one the mediocrity, he nevertheless would have worked as Antonio's assistant. How much more likely is this when we recall the poverty of his endowments! Again, if Antonio, in 1460, was receiving commissions of such importance, his fame as a painter must have been established already, and of some years' standing. It is therefore as good as impossible that he was taught painting by Piero: the direct contrary is, in fact,

\* See "Archivio Storico" for 1892, p. 208.

† It generally is assumed that these must be copies made by Antonio after the larger versions. But against this I would urge that artists as a rule do not work from large to small, but *vice versa*; that here there is no trace of Piero's hand, while, as Antonio expressly states, the younger brother worked with him on the large works; that, moreover, if Antonio was so busy that he had to work in partnership over an original intended for great patrons, he surely would have left the execution of the copies to other hands.



demonstrated. In 1460, Piero working with Antonio could have done so only as the latter's assistant.

This dependence on the elder brother continued through life; and a vigorous inquiry into the share of each in the works of both, confirms amply the suspicion expressed with his usual insight by the late Signor Cavalcaselle,\* that Piero could have been throughout his career little more than the assistant of Antonio. And in spite of the fable with which Vasari begins the history of their relationship as painters, he also seems to have considered Piero in no other light, for to Piero alone he does not ascribe a single important work,† while to Antonio alone he ascribes several (with more or less reason as we shall see); and he mentions the younger brother only in connection with works executed by both.

First in date among the works which Vasari ascribes to both, comes the picture of St. James between St. Eustace and St. Lawrence, now in the Uffizi [1301], but painted for the altar of the Portuguese Chapel at S. Miniato. Its date is determined by the fact that this chapel was dedicated in 1466.‡ Thanks to the way these three figures stand—like colossi towering over the landscape and the distant skyline,—thanks to the dainty marble parapet behind them, with its rope-work pattern giving glimpses below of the river spreading in pools to bask in the sun, it is a work of no small charm. Yet the figures are indifferent. While the idea of the picture may well be Antonio's, I cannot believe that he as much as furnished the complete cartoon for it; for Antonio would not have made people stand so badly as these do, would not have made them so square and flat-shouldered as is St. Eustace, nor so common and vulgar as is the head of St. James. Then, although painted some seventeen years earlier than the S. Gimignano Coronation, the characteristics we found in that indubitable work of Piero, already occur in the S. Miniato picture. The colouring, particularly in the flesh parts, is very blond, the contrasts of light and shade are crude and sharp, the eyes tend to project, the features are pinched, the hands are comparatively large and lifeless, and some of them of a shape never affected by Antonio. Whatever superiority this work has to the one at S. Gimignano I would assign to its having been executed under the eyes of Antonio, after whose sketch it doubtless was worked.

A painting of about the same date, conceivably somewhat earlier, is the Annunciation at Berlin [73]. It is a work in which again the figures are inferior to the surroundings, which in idea surpass, and in execution do not fall below, the finest Annunciation ever executed by Van Eyck's best followers. The Madonna and Gabriel are in a hall of precious marbles and bronze, partitioned off by a wall into two chambers, one of which stretches away to a loggia overlooking a plain,

\* Later criticism would find little to do if Signor Cavalcaselle, instead of invariably neglecting, had invariably followed up all his intuitions.

† I am aware of course that Vasari ascribes to Piero alone the Annunciation and the frescoes in the Portuguese Chapel at S. Miniato, really by Baldovinetti. The mistake could have arisen only because Vasari had got it into his head that the Pollajuolo executed all the paintings in this chapel, and ascribed Baldovinetti's work to Piero alone, because of their striking inferiority to the joint work of the two brothers.

‡ Vasari, "Sansoni," III. 95.

and the other to a window opening out on the same plain. It is the landscape we already have found in the S. Miniato picture, and we shall find it at least thrice again in other paintings by the Pollajuolo. It was the landscape of Alessio Baldovinetti: Verrocchio will endow it with more fancy; and then it will be ready for Leonardo's transfiguring imagination. In this Berlin Annunciation we see more clearly than elsewhere that it is nothing else than the Valdarno; for if you walk to the window, you will behold Florence zoned by her splendid walls, and crowned with Brunellesco's dome.

Antonio's part in this fascinating but unequal painting would seem even smaller than in the S. Miniato altar-piece. He furnished some drawings for it, no doubt, and superintended the execution, but he could not have done the painting, nor could he have furnished as much as a complete cartoon. I know no other work which the Pollajuolo undertook together where the figures point so distinctly to Piero. The Madonna has the round oval, the pinched features characteristic of him. She is coloured blond, her draperies are comparatively flowing, her hands lifeless. Gabriel is somewhat better and more like Antonio's work, yet his hands and the impasto of his face betray Piero's touch. The charming group of angels, whose music comes to us from the loggia, bears no less witness to Piero as their author.

This picture, then, may safely be assigned, for all but the conception, to Piero. But we must not leave it without drawing the proper conclusion from the obvious inequality between the figures and the surroundings. The painstaking execution of detail, much of it, however, little more than mechanical, surely characterises the craftsman more than the artist, the assistant rather than the inventor. The same talent that in this kind of painting will give satisfaction, will fail in the task of portraying the figure. In short, we are forced to the conviction that Piero's was the pottering assistant's talent, not the creator's.

The date of the Virtues painted for the Mercatanzia of Florence, and ascribed by Vasari to both brothers, is unknown but may be determined. One of them, the "Fortezza," was painted by Sandro Botticelli, presumably at the same time, certainly not earlier. Now in this figure Sandro's style is still so undeveloped that Morelli failed to discern his hand therein. In truth, this work shows Botticelli as almost overwhelmed under the influence of Pollajuolo\* and Verrocchio. Now the first of Sandro's works to which a date can be assigned is the Berlin St. Sebastian [1128] which seems to have been painted in the later months of 1473.† This picture witnesses to its painter's debt to the Pollajuolo, or it would perhaps not have passed for long years as theirs; nevertheless Botticelli here is already himself

\* It could have been no mere accident that led to Botticelli's painting one panel in a series to be done by the Pollajuolo. Does it not point to his close connection with them, or even to his having been at the time in their employ? Again, it is not likely that Botticelli would have been given this commission, unless it had been felt that his panel would not be out of harmony with the others. So we are forced to one of two kindred conclusions: either Sandro was just then still on terms of close connection with the Pollajuolo, or he had been, and the similarity of his style to theirs was so obvious that he was expected to paint in their character.

† See "Codice Magliabechiano," Edition Frey, p. 105.

nearly as much as in the "Primavera." To have so well asserted himself against an influence so powerful must have taken Sandro several years, particularly as his speed in development does not seem to have been very rapid. We therefore shall date the "Fortezza" no later than 1470, and assign the other figures in the group to about the same date.

Let us now see what share each of the Pollajuolo had in these Virtues. One of them, the Prudence [Uffizi, 1306], seems to be almost universally accepted as Piero's own work. In truth, nothing could well be more clearly his. The blond colouring, the striking contrasts of light and shade, the broad oval, the comparatively flowing draperies are all characteristics that we have found in the S. Gimignano Coronation and in the other paintings which we already have assigned to Piero. Antonio's share here probably was very small. He scarcely could have furnished for it more than an indication.

The remaining Virtues offer difficulties to the critic which he can overcome, if at all, only with patience and caution; for these Virtues never could have been executed by either of the brothers, and the task of deciding what share each had in their creation is thereby much increased. To some minds ruin and restoration seem amply to account for the appalling feebleness of their execution. To me they seem neither in better nor worse condition—although it is bad enough—than a thousand other old pictures, wherein, nevertheless, the original character still is traceable. The feebleness and paltriness of these panels point to hands much inferior to Piero's even—in fact, to assistants.

It is commonly supposed that Piero executed these five Virtues. This cannot be true. It is as commonly accepted that Antonio furnished the completed cartoons for all of them. This is only less true. That he did not make a cartoon for the Prudence painted by Piero we already have seen. Similar considerations must lead us to conclude that the finished cartoon for the Justice, the Faith, and possibly the Hope were also not made by Antonio but by Piero; for these figures have the characteristics both of colour and form that we have now several times recounted as his. In the case of one of these we have something like convincing proof. Among the drawings of the Uffizi there is a head for the Faith, of the same size as the painting, and pricked for transfer. Now as the oval of this head, as the mouth, the nostrils and the eyes, and as the timidity of the execution, leave no doubt but that this study is by Piero, and as it certainly is the design for the head of the Faith, it follows that here at least Piero furnished his own cartoon.

The Temperance and the Charity, on the contrary, must go back to cartoons by Antonio; the ovals are longer, the folds more angular, the colour-scheme darker. And the happiest of accidents has preserved for us on the back of the Charity Antonio's original cartoon, as if to prove that neither the great artist who drew it, nor any one who at all approached him, as Piero did at times, could possibly have painted the finished daub.\*

\* If the Pollajuolo furnished the cartoons only, it may be asked how these Virtues nevertheless betray the colour-



Vasari ascribed still another work to both the brothers, the Tobias and the Angel painted for Or Sammichele, and now in the Turin Gallery. For the deep tones of its golden brown colouring, for the splendid movement of the figures, for the penetrating charm of the landscape, and for the decorative harmony between the background and the figures, it is one of the masterpieces of Florentine Art. Here Piero's share must have been small indeed. Perhaps there is something of his hand in the face of the Archangel, a merest touch in the face of the Tobias. Otherwise the colouring points to Antonio's execution, and the movement and swing certainly to his finished cartoons. Fancy Piero giving you a figure with such a buoyant step as Tobias has, or feet planted so firmly as the Angel's!

I would place the execution of this masterpiece soon after 1470,\* and if Vasari's statement is right Antonio, this time alone, painted the Martyrdom of St. Sebastian in 1475.† Rarely has criticism been more correctly and subtly appreciative of the essential, life-communicating qualities in a work of art than are the lines devoted by Messer Giorgio to this great masterpiece. There is in this work scarcely a motive but what is derived from the imperious demands of art as form and movement. These determine the pose of the St. Sebastian and the attitude of the bowmen, whether while shooting or loading, and account for the careering horses in the plain, and for the subjects in the bas-reliefs on the triumphal arch. As for the landscape with its waters, its distances, and its lingering hazes, there is scarcely one among those painted by Leonardo's precursors which so closely approaches the background of the Mona Lisa.

Now it is not to be conceived that such motives and such beauty should have come from the brain and hand of such a mediocrity as Piero; and indeed the more one studies this masterpiece in detail, not only does one the more appreciate its greatness, but the more does one convince oneself that it is altogether Antonio's own work.

We now have examined all the paintings not in fresco ascribed by Vasari to the Pollajuolo that have come down to us. But there are others. The exquisite Apollo and Daphne‡ [National Gallery, 928] is by the best critics ascribed to scheme of each of the brothers. The answer may be suggested that each of them gave the proper colour-indications to his assistants, and that of these some surely must more habitually have been under the direction of the one rather than of the other partner.

\* The hands here with their loose-jointed fingers are so strikingly like Signorelli's that they furnish one of the best indications of the latter's great debt to Pollajuolo. The date gives us a notion of the time when the relation was formed. A still more obvious resemblance between Signorelli and Pollajuolo may be seen in their Martyrdoms of St. Sebastian, Signorelli's being at Città di Castello, and painted in 1496.

† Vasari gives dates so seldom that he must have had clear indications in this instance; yet 1475 cannot be accepted without some difficulty as the date of this picture. Botticelli's St. Sebastian, painted at the end of 1473, indicates, in the pose of the saint, and particularly in the pressure of the feet, an acquaintance with the saint here—or, as is probable, and as would obviate the difficulty, with another kindred figure by Pollajuolo executed earlier. Richa knew another Martyrdom of St. Sebastian in S. Jacopo sopr' Arno. See "Chiese Fiorentine," Vol. X., p. 355.

‡ The Hercules slaying Nessus in the Jarves Collection at New Haven, U.S.A., were it well preserved, would be more than a match for this picture, and despite its ruin, it remains one of the gems of Florentine painting. Few landscapes are more beautiful than is here the Arno rapidly streaming away from distant Florence, and the more distant hills where it had its birth. The structure and action of the Hercules as he draws his bow are not surpassed elsewhere in Antonio's best work. This picture has apparently attracted no notice. I am indebted for my acquaintance with it to Mr. William Rankin, who first published it ("American Journal of Archeology," Vol. X., No. II.).

Antonio, and I am happy to be of their opinion. But in Berlin there are two works both ascribed to Piero, which are by Antonio, if any paintings are by him. One of these is the powerful profile of a lady in the Hainauer Collection. Here not only the cartoon but the execution is Antonio's, as the colouring and the energy of the conception prove.\* Would you see what Piero was on his own account as a portrait painter, look in the Uffizi, at a charming but timid profile of a lady, scarcely more than a miniature. True, in the Uffizi [No. 3358] this profile, on the principle now prevalent in certain circles of criticism, that whatever is unidentified must be Ferrarese,† is assigned to Ercole Grandi; but the pinched features, the impasto, the ivory colouring, the hair, even the shape of the ear prove Piero's authorship. The other work by the Pollajuolo at Berlin is the David, in the Gallery [73a]. How a work of this depth of colour, of this perfection of movement, of this refinement of features can be ascribed to Piero passes the reaches of my understanding, particularly as a careful comparison of details between this jewel and the indisputable works by Antonio establishes the exact contrary. Fancy Piero, with his heavy, rather unformed faces, producing a type of such Botticellian daintiness as this David!

There remains one other work to be considered. It is the splendid profile of the eagle-faced Galeazzo Sforza in the Uffizi [30] ascribed to Piero. The blond colouring may point to his execution, but the conception certainly is not his. If he worked on it at all he must have done it on Antonio's elaborate cartoon. But I confess that the more I study this splendidly constructed and ably interpreted bust, the harder do I find it to believe that Piero had his hand in it at all.

Of the one or two frescoes attributed by Vasari to the Pollajuolo recent writers have taken no note, believing that they had perished. This, unfortunately, seems true. Yet the one fresco which Vasari describes in detail, the fresco copied repeatedly by Michelangelo, the St. Christopher on the facade of S. Miniato fra le Torri, is not wholly lost. A replica of it on a smaller scale exists, although it has travelled far from Florence. It is now in the Metropolitan Museum [85] at New York.‡ We see St. Christopher wading the stream: "*una gamba del Santo in atto di posare e l'altra di levare*," as Baldinucci says—his right hand supported on a slender palm-tree, his left arm akimbo on his hip, looking around at the Child on his shoulder. The giant ferryman is really wading, and you feel his feet pushing down to the bottom of the stream; the Child weighs down on the shoulder; all the pressures, all the movements are communicated to us as only a great master

\* I here may venture to express my conviction that the famous engraved profile of a lady in the Berlin Print Room—perhaps the finest of all Florentine profiles—was at least designed by Antonio.

† A generation ago, on the contrary, Ferrarese pictures of the earlier and better kind used to be ascribed to Pollajuolo, as for instance Cossa's Annunciation at Dresden.

‡ It measures 112½ in. in height and 59 in. in breadth, and is therefore but a quarter the size of the S. Miniato fresco which measured ten *braccia*. I call it a replica, not only because it answers so well to the various descriptions of the larger work, but because Antonio was far keener on rendering movement than on varying his motives. Having once found a motive so satisfactory, he is not at all likely to have departed from it. For the measurements and a photograph of this fresco I am indebted to Prof. Allan Marquand.

can render them. When, however, we come to the question of actual execution, it is not easy to decide. I can scarcely doubt that the finished cartoon for this fresco was furnished by Antonio, but the ear and the hand, and draperies on the chest, would point to Piero.

Fortunately no doubt can cross one's mind as to which of the Pollajuolo executed the matchless fragment, representing five nude figures dancing in Bacchic frenzy, discovered this autumn (1897) under whitewash, in a small villa close to the Torre del Gallo, outside Florence.\* The swing and power of the movement, the masterly modelling in contours, the grouping, reveal the dazzling presence of an artist of the most exalted rank. Here there can be no talk of the assistant's hand, for the outlines seemed breathed on to the wall rather than painfully executed. Here therefore we have perfect proof not only that Antonio was a painter, but with leisure to decorate;† for a mere accident has brought these to light, and it is not likely that they are more than a specimen of many such works. As this painting must have been executed before Botticelli's *Primavera*, and as in type the figures agree with those in the Embroideries of S. Giovanni, drawn as we remember somewhat before 1470, and as in structure they recall the figures on one of the bas-reliefs on the triumphal arch in the Martyrdom of St. Sebastian, we may safely assign it to a year following soon after this last date.‡

#### IV

Looking straight at the works in question, aided only by such authorities as Vasari, and supported by such bits of documents as happen to exist, we have now carefully studied the works of the Pollajuolo, and assigned as well as we could to each his share. In the process we have learned the characteristics of each, and the qualities of each. Now, we are ready to turn to what more especially concerns us, the drawings of these two masters.

The difficulties we shall encounter are not small, and they arise chiefly in the progressive inferiority of most of the drawings to one or two of the best, and not

\* First identified and published by Mary Logan in *Chronique des Arts*, 1897, p. 343. Mme. Logan not only gives an excellent description but ample proofs of her attribution, and I refer the reader to her article.

† The execution seems to have been *al secco*, and would thus confirm the hypothesis, strong enough as it is already, of a close connection between *both* the Pollajuolo and Baldovinetti. Since the above was written, these frescoes have been completely re-painted. (Photographed by Brogi.)

‡ It is to this very time that Dr. Ulmann would assign the frescoes in the Palazzo Venezia at Rome, by him ascribed to the Pollajuolo—frescoes in which we see the human being not aflame with life and action, as in Signor Galetti's dancing figures, but resembling of all things in creation pig-skins full of wine. Dr. Ulmann was much better inspired when he recognised the hand of the Pollajuolo in the fresco around the bull's eye window in the Portuguese Chapel at S. Miniato. Here we see two splendid angels, of beautiful face and powerful limbs, flying towards us, and pulling aside curtains. But Dr. Ulmann spoils his discovery by ascribing them to Piero, whereas the deep colouring, the elegance of the features, and the perfection of the movement point to Antonio—and indeed to his highest achievements. If I do not mistake, we have a good specimen of fresco by Piero alone in the Ascension of the Virgin in the sacristy of S. Niccolò at Florence. It is inscribed with the forged date 1450, but is of course later. The types, the draperies and the landscape point clearly to Piero, while showing his close relation to Baldovinetti—to whom, indeed, Signor Cavalcaselle ascribed it.



the least authenticable. At a certain point the inferiority becomes so great that we no longer can be dealing with even the less inspired moments of the master himself, but with imitators or copyists.

For one who conceives of a perfect drawing as the most spontaneous and rapid notation by the artist's hand of the idea in his mind—the idea being the life-enhancing communication of plastic life and movement—for such an one, no existing drawings will surpass and but few will equal Antonio's pen-sketch (in the British Museum) for his Hercules and the Hydra. As in the finished picture, the hero rushes forward, sucking the earth with the foot he stands on, wielding the club in his right hand, but—and here it differs—his other hand has not yet grasped, is still feeling for the hydra's neck. Her shape we scarcely distinguish. She leaps up like a conflagration, and as if to meet her in equal contest, the hero's club flowers out in flames. And there is something here almost more than flame-like, a suggestion of a transparent, unsubstantial medium, thin and ethereal, with body just enough to convey to us the joy in the hero's labour. It is the same abstemiousness of touch, the same asceticism of means that we find at times in Rembrandt, and more frequently in Hokusai.

We must place a wide interval between this, perhaps the highest, achievement of Florentine draughtsmanship and even the best of Antonio's remaining drawings. The least unworthy of the same hand are the sketch in the Albertina already discussed in Section II. and the flower-like design in the Uffizi [No. 942] for a reliquary or monstrance. A motive which the ordinary goldsmith would have niggled down to the painful drawing of a mechanic, is here transfigured into living substance, by a vitalising touch, which renders the object with a vigour that genial nature gives to her generous growths. Next to it I would rank the pen-drawing of a St. John in the Uffizi, and the cartoon for the Charity in the same collection.

The St. John is so refined and dainty that until recently, when Dr. Frizzoni published it as Antonio's, it passed for a Giorgione. The Baptist stands with his goat-skin clinging to him, his head a little to one side, his hand to his heart. In type, were he but in profile, he would scarcely differ from the Hercules. His hands are intimately Antonio's. In structure he is excellent. The pen stroke is fine, and caressing, daintily modelling as it passes. But we miss here the economy of means, the inevitableness of touch that we found in the Hercules.

The cartoon for the Charity is elaborately drawn on the clean grain of the panel in powerful black chalk, and lit up with white. We should go astray if we insisted here on the most distinguishing qualities of the Hercules. This Charity has its own great merits. Dainty precision of modelling, sure indication of the pressures, splendid ease in action, are here conveyed with an energy of stroke and a brilliancy of chiaroscuro, in themselves, quite apart from what they represent, pleasure-giving. But why this pathetic attempt to describe, when you will understand so much better if you will look at the cartoon and at the finished work together?

I will not speak of the contemptible drawing and the uncouth modelling of the latter, but of something far more easy to imitate, the mere oval, the mere action. Look at the high-bred, distinguished face\* of the Charity in the cartoon, and at the clinging of the Child in the one, and the dangling in the other. The executant may or may not have lacked ability, but he certainly lacked the feeling for art, or even for beauty.

Next to these in order of merit we must place the two pen-sketches in the Uffizi, which, until Morelli discerned in them Antonio's hand, passed for Signorelli's work.† In one we see the naked Adam leaning on his hoe, looking up at the sky dolefully, as if to implore pity for his intolerable labour; in the other the naked Eve sits on a rock spinning, while the little Cain and Abel are playing about her. The effect here is largely of outline, although a little wash helps out the modelling; but in and by itself the line has little of that astounding swiftness and certainty which we found in the Hercules. Although more tentative and timid as we must grant it, it finds nevertheless ample justification; for here Antonio had another purpose. Not the joy in another's exuberant, victorious energy has he attempted to communicate in these figures, but mere existence. The line caresses as it models, makes you follow with keen pleasure every enveloping curve, every boss, every turn, makes you realise with the vividness of positive contact the texture of the skin, the elasticity of the flesh, and the resistance of the muscles. Then, too, how it gives you the masses and the pressures, how your attention is made to dwell on the sides of the thorax until you feel as if you saw and touched the back as well! Realistic, naturalistic you will call these figures. True, they scarcely are copies of anything in preceding art; they betray a Huron's neglect of the antique. Hence, to one who conceives of Italian art as an imitation or continuation of Greco-Roman art, these figures will seem somewhat Northern, will suggest Sluter and the great sculptors of Burgundy rather than Raphael and his precursors. Donatello's St. John reading‡—to mention of his but one out of many—and Niccolò del Arca's Wailing over the Dead Christ, have the same defect.

Among the few drawings yet to be discussed as Antonio's own, three share in the qualities of the Adam and the Eve. In the Musée Condé at Chantilly is the head, about half the size of life, of an oldish man, with a look of vague pain flitting over his face. It is a head in the character of the Adam, but as a head it is more satisfactory. It is powerfully executed in black chalk.§ In the British Museum there is a large sheet on which we see in bistre on a ground coloured dark a judge

\* In the reproduction—on a reduced scale, by the way—the face unfortunately is blurred. This is a fault in the negative and not in the original.

† This need rouse no wonder, for Signorelli's indebtedness to Antonio Pollajuolo was, as we already have observed, great. The Adam, moreover, more than usually betrays Antonio's affinities with the following of Domenico Veneziano. Cf. in S. Francesco at Arezzo the nude figure leaning on a staff in Piero dei Franceschi's fresco representing the Death of Adam.

‡ Donatello in the Bargello at Florence: Niccolò del Arca in S. Maria della Vite at Bologna.

§ At Chantilly it is ascribed to Mantegna; but its real authorship is so obvious that proofs are superfluous. To my surprise Morelli failed to recognise it, and describes it as a "copy" presumably after Mantegna.

on a throne, two officers standing to his right, and four men leading up a manacled prisoner, all the figures being nude. As an illustration this drawing repels and yet fascinates, like those bas-reliefs expressive of high scorn and hissing cruelty wherewith the Ferrarese Ercole Roberti was wont to adorn the thrones of his Madonnas. Possibly Pollajuolo may have intended this sketch for a kindred purpose. A similar subject, treated not altogether differently, may, at all events, be seen on the triumphal arch in the Martyrdom of St. Sebastian. The attitudes suggest Castagno, but the movement, wafted from figure to figure, like the shadow of a cloud passing over a cornfield, is peculiarly his own, as exemplified, for instance, in the Dancing Nudes at Arcetri recently discovered. The effect is here so much an effect of mere outline that we seem, at first sight, to be looking at *sgraffiti*. But the contours have the functional qualities of modelling that they have in the Eve. As tonic decoration this work deserves a place close beside the engraving of the Battle of the Nudes. A perfect companion to this magnificent design is a fragment at Wilton House of the cartoon that Antonio must have executed for the engraver of the famous but inferior print representing Hercules overcoming the Giants. We have the three figures on the extreme right only. Except that they are less instinct with life, less firm in contour, they differ in no respect from their brothers in the British Museum design.

Two further sketches, although somewhat inferior to any of the last, yet merit a place among Antonio's drawings. The less valuable of the two is a ruined pen-sketch,\* which a later hand has gone over in places, for a Sebastian, probably for the Martyrdom. It never could have been very spirited, although the outline, here and there, and significant traits, justify its attribution to Antonio. The other, partaking in quality and execution more of the character of the Nudes in the British Museum, is the sketch at Munich for the equestrian monument to Francesco Sforza. Against a background of bistre we see as in *sgraffito*, Sforza in profile on a careering horse, trampling down a prostrate soldier.† The condition of the drawing is too bad to enable us to judge of its original quality; but the line, as in the horse's mane and tail, is in places still excellent, the modelling is firm, and the action of horse and rider as a group, easy yet majestic. It is curious, by the way, to find Antonio harking back in this sketch, made late in life, to impressions he must have had in his earliest years, for the likeness between this equestrian group and Uccello's splendid drawing in the Uffizi is in many ways striking.

Before we proceed to those few drawings whose motives and mannerisms proclaim their derivation from Antonio Pollajuolo, but whose quality forbids our accepting them as more than good contemporary imitations or copies, we must devote our attention to Piero as a draughtsman. It will not take us long, for I, at least, know but one drawing that we may certainly assign to him. The study of

\* Formerly in Morelli's collection, and now belonging to Dr. Gustavo Frizzoni.

† This corresponds to the description of one of the drawings in Vasari's possession: "*Egli è tutto armato, e sopra un basamento pieno di battaglie, fa saltare il cavallo addosso a un armato.*" The base, however, is lacking. This drawing was first identified as Pollajuolo's by Morelli.



his paintings has taught us that he was not merely a much feebler version of Antonio. He had a certain individuality, certain mild mannerisms of his own. It will not do, therefore, to ascribe to him, as apparently has been done hitherto, all the Pollajuolesque drawings too poor to be Antonio's. Such are far more likely the work of conscious imitators or copyists. Searching among the drawings existing for any that betray Piero's mannerisms, I have, as I have said, found one only, that one being the cartoon in the Uffizi which we have already examined as the head for the Fides. It is timid, tentative, feeble, but thanks to its use of black and red chalk, is not without charm. The scarcity of Piero's drawings would be explained by the tradition that he generally worked on his brother's sketches. The one that we have is scarcely a sketch, but a cartoon.

It is not improbable, however, that just one other drawing may be Piero's. It is also in the Uffizi [No. 7630], and contains a sketch of a horse, and below it that of the head of an elderly man. The latter is in type so much like the hard-featured people in the S. Gimignano altar-piece, and the quality of its draughtsmanship is so painstaking and "respectable," that I am more than inclined to believe that it was made, not by the great master Verrocchio, to whom it is attributed, but by our mediocre Piero.

In the Uffizi there is a large sheet [101 Cat. II] which as design is admirable, but, as its line has almost entirely disappeared under the pricking for transfer, and as its ink has corroded it, we no longer can distinguish whether it was by Antonio or Piero, whether it is an original, or a faithful copy. It represents St. Jerome kneeling in fervent penitence beside a cross seen sideways, in the midst of a vast landscape, wherein we still descry mountains and winding streams, the sea, and ships, and a harbour, and beasts and birds. The conception certainly would do Antonio no discredit. More it is not wise to affirm.

Among the most striking of the good contemporary imitations or copies, is the drawing at Hertford House, sometimes described as *The Death of Gattamelata*. A number of wailing nudes, with gestures of frantic grief, surround a tomb. To Antonio this *motif* was, as his *Combat of Gladiators*, a splendid occasion for rendering the figure in violent, life-communicating action; and in truth, it is not the wailing that reaches our ears, nor do the grimacing, contorted faces appeal to our eyes, but the violent action potently communicates strength to our own nerves. Unfortunately, we may not look too close, or the effect will vanish, for it is the motive only that is excellent; the detail betrays the feeble hand of one who did not feel and create, but merely copied.\*

At Hamburg there is a large sheet containing two centaurs engaged in mortal combat. The fury of their onset, the attempt they make, each while striking, to ward off the other's blow, is a motive in every way as calculated for the rendering of force and pressures as the Hercules and Antæus, or anything in the *Combat of the Nudes*. But it all is palsied before the action has fully taken place; or, at

\* Judging by the types, the original must have been from Antonio's earlier years.

least, so you would say, for here again hand and mind have not worked together, and the hard lines betray the copyist. The original must have been a sketch by Pollajuolo of which other echoes have come down to us, as a drawing in the Uffizi ascribed to Raphael [No. 1476, Cornice 265], or much clearer, the engraving, for which indeed the original may have been intended, ascribed to Antonio, but certainly not by him, representing the fight of two centaurs in the presence of three armed men.

Better than either of these in execution, but somewhat less interesting in conception, is the splendid nude man with arms folded across his breast, in M. Léon Bonnat's collection. The contours are too rigid, the pressures not adequately indicated, to permit of ascribing the drawing before us to Antonio himself. It is no more than an excellent old copy. The determined, dare-devil look, the sure and easy pose, bring Antonio closer here than usual to his precursor Castagno.

Three or four drawings of somewhat inferior quality now demand attention, and then we shall have done. The best of them is at Berlin, a nude bowman. The action is conceived in a manner that could not be improved upon, but the execution is far too stiff and too empty for aught but a copy. In Christ Church Library at Oxford there is a drawing for a Dante showing an open book. It is a charming but feeble copy of a lost Antonio,\* and the affinity with Castagno's Portraits of Worthies is distinctly felt. The two remaining drawings are in the Uffizi. One is of the Baptist pointing, and the other of a young man looking up in an attitude of supplication. In the latter sketch the tension of the whole figure is admirable, but again the outline is wooden. Other copies and imitations exist in numbers, but we have nothing to learn from them regarding Antonio Pollajuolo as a draughtsman.†

\* The claw-like hands prove this conclusively, although of course the character of the drawing is, in other respects as well, unmistakable.

† There exists, scattered among various collections, a fairly large number of drawings by a feeble draughtsman whose manner proves him to have been a close follower of Antonio Pollajuolo, although signs of his having also suffered Pesellino's influence are not wanting. There has of late been a tendency to identify this childish craftsman with Maso Finiguerra. For a full and admirable sketch of this "artistic personality" I refer the reader to Mr. Sidney Colvin's sumptuous work, "Finiguerra's Florentine Picture Chronicle." London, B. Quaritch, 1898.

## CHAPTER III

### VERROCCHIO AND LORENZO DI CREDI

ANDREA DEL VERROCCHIO remains one of the most enigmatic figures among the great masters of Florence. His contemporaries seem to have bestowed upon him a fluctuating esteem. Venice chose him from among the many sculptors of Italy to erect the equestrian statue to Colleoni; Pistoja, on the other hand, for the Fortiguerra monument, seems to have preferred Piero, the less gifted Pollajuolo.\* Ugolino Verini, writing in 1502 or 1503, insists rather upon Verrocchio's qualities as a teacher than as an artist.† Fifty years later, Vasari, while duly appreciating the subtle hard-won beauty of this or that work by Andrea, records his general impression that Verrocchio was more industrious than gifted, and adds that, to the vulgar, he seemed both affected and tame, although he did not fail in gaining the admiration of the few. In our times he has, thus far, been more perhaps a subject for controversy than for appreciative criticism. And this is well, for how shall we form an estimate of his gifts as an artist, unless we first know what works are to be assigned to him? But it is not so well that the question of the extent of his influence has allowed certain eminent writers to prejudice their opinion of Verrocchio as an artist. These problems do not really touch one another. It remains a moot point whether the expansion of a man's influence be necessarily in relation of cause and effect to his personality; it certainly stands quite apart from the intrinsic value of his work as art. Touching his rank as an artist, we should confine ourselves strictly to an estimate based on a study of his works.

What paintings I would ascribe to Verrocchio I have indicated elsewhere,‡ and in the same small book I have ventured to state my idea of his qualities as an

\* "Ora Piero del Pollajuolo a facto il modello che per noi li fu imposto; il quale ci pare più bello et più d'ogni darte et più piace a contento di mess. piero fratello di dco. Monsignore et di tutta la sua famiglia, et simul di noi et di tutti e cittadini della nra. città, che l'anno veduto, che non fa quello d'andrea."—Gay, "Carteggio," I, 257.

† "Nec tibi Lysippe est Thuscus Verrochius impar,  
A quo quicquid habent pictores, fonte biberunt:  
Discipulos pene edocuit Verrochius omnes.  
Quorum nunc volitat Tyrrhena per oppida nomen."

"De Illustratione Urbis Florentiae," II., Florence, Landini, 1636, p. 46.

‡ "The Florentine Painters of the Renaissance."



artist. I must confess that I have been more determined in my judgment by pictures largely accepted as Leonardo's, such as the Annunciation in the Uffizi, and the Bust of a Lady in the Lichtenstein Gallery, than by the Baptism of the Florence Academy. For the last-named work is a lamentable wreck, while the two others are in much better condition. True, they are still ascribed to Leonardo, but they are so demonstrably Verrocchio's that they cannot fail to be accepted as his. Gladly would I give the demonstrations here and now, but I must forego them, for they are not necessary to our task. The sculptures universally accepted as Verrocchio's furnish sufficient criteria for the selection of the drawings to be ascribed to him.

This selection has already been made by Morelli, and while it is not a contribution to the subject quite equalling in value such of Dr. Bode's masterly suggestions on the same topic as will ultimately be accepted, yet it will go a great way to offset his contempt for Verrocchio's early Madonna at Berlin and his blindness before the Uffizi Annunciation.

The most interesting, by far, of these drawings is the sheet in the Louvre [Plate xxiii.], containing on both sides pen-and-ink sketches of *putti* in most of the attitudes that Verrocchio and his pupils were wont to pose them. One little fellow has the precise gesture of the Child blessing in the terra-cotta Madonna from S. Maria Nuova, now in the Uffizi. Another reaches out his little hands—hands which Leonardo transmitted to his Lombard followers—with the appealing grace of the Child in the "Vierge aux Rochers." Yet others, with their fingers to their mouths, were evidently intended to sit or lie in the laps of hieratic Madonnas.\* One recalls Verrocchio's terra-cotta *putto* in Berlin; still another has the softness of body and roguishness of expression of the cupids in Correggio's Danae.

These are rapid sketches penned with the greatest freedom, yet every stroke accomplishes its indispensable task. The soft-boned little bodies are rendered in all their charming plumpness, with all their pliant suppleness. You feel the pressure of part on part, the stretch of the skin everywhere; you scarcely can help caressing the back of the Correggiquesque imp, or joining in play with the creature who runs as if pretending to be frightened. Here, at all events, there is neither affectation nor tameness. The impression conveyed is one of perfect spontaneity, and the means, as I have said, are of the readiest. Neither Leonardo, nor Titian, nor even Rubens, in their drawings of children ever seem more artless or more fascinating.†

\* One of these recalls the child in the Madonna of Verrocchio's *atelier*, in the Sheffield Museum. The other, more distinctly the child in the beautiful Madonna of the National Gallery [No. 276], which, in part at least, may be by Verrocchio himself.

† One of the leaves, in the His de la Salle Collection, of the so-called "Verrocchio Sketch-Book" contains a child blessing in the precise attitude of the one here. As there could not well be a better instance of the difference between good art and bad art, I would recommend students to compare the two. (The His de la Salle *putto* is reproduced—unfortunately on a smaller and far too flattering scale—in Dr. Gronau's most valuable article on the "Verrocchio Sketch-Book," *Jahrb. Preuss. Kunst.* 1896.)

For convenience I reprint here M. de Chennevière's transliteration (*Gazette des Beaux Arts*, Nouv. Ser. 19,

It will not be deemed necessary to discuss the genuineness of this masterpiece of draughtsmanship. Sparing ourselves such a futile task, we may now turn to a drawing of somewhat slighter merit, although still Verrocchio's—the black chalk sketch for the head of an angel in the Uffizi [Plate xxiv.]. It has been pricked for transfer, is somewhat tattered, and completely re-touched, but is yet of an authenticity that never has been questioned. It has all those morphological characteristics of Verrocchio which Morelli has so accurately noted down.\* In quality it is not unworthy of the master, although the modelling might conceivably be said to convey more an impression of a hollow thing of cast or beaten metal than of firm flesh covering firmer bone. The curling hair is highly decorative, and has a life of its own, as in Leonardo's locks. The pose and the expression more than merely anticipate the charm and depth of certain heads drawn by Verrocchio's great pupil.† This angel is like enough to the one seen almost full face in the Baptism to make it possible that it was a study for the picture. At all events, a comparison of the two is instructive.

Even closer to Leonardo than this, not only in type and expression, but in the decorative use of black chalk, is the life-size head of a woman in the Malcolm Collection of the British Museum [Plate xxv.]. She bends somewhat more down to the left than the angel in the Uffizi, though not so tenderly, and her hair streams warmly over her shoulders, and is twisted into a knot at the back. It is the arrangement of hair that Leonardo frequently sketched, and which Sodoma,‡ his most gifted follower, took over from him. Indeed, a little more freedom, and somewhat less of obvious naturalism, would place this head on a level with Leonardo's happiest achievements.§ The difference is most striking perhaps in the modelling. Leonardo makes us feel much less effort on the part of the artist, and as spectators he brings us into far more intimate contact with the osseous structure of a face. Yet I know not whether the softness of flesh as here on the lids, and on the chin, has often been rendered better.

These, so far as I am aware, are all the drawings that safely may be considered Verrocchio's. We have examined them carefully, but they have yielded no results

p. 516) of the doggerel epigram, in an almost contemporary hand, which fills one corner of the drawing with the *putti*:

*"Viderunt equum mirandaeque arte confectum  
Quem nobiles Veneti tibi dedere facturum,  
Florentie decus crasse mihi crede, Varochie,  
Qui te plus oculis amant diliguntque coluntque  
Atque cum Jupiter animas infuderit ipsi  
Hoc tibi Domitius rogat Salmonicus idem."  
"Vale et bene qui legis."*

\* "Die Galerien zu München & Dresden," p. 350.

† The head, for instance, of the Madonna in the "Vierge aux Rochers."

‡ It must have been some vague feeling of this resemblance which, before Morelli's discovery of its real author, made this drawing pass as of the "North Italian School."—Sir Charles Robinson's "Catalogue of the Malcolm Collection," p. 121.

§ Morelli, when he identified this drawing, suggested that it might be one of the heads that had belonged to Vasari, of which Messer Giorgio writes as follows: "*Sono alcuni disegni di sua mano nel nostro Libro fatti con molto pazienza e grandissimo giudizio; infra i quali sono alcune teste di femmina con bell' arie ed acconciature di capelli, quali, per la sua bellezza, Leonardo da Vinci sempre imitò.*"

to change greatly our estimate of Verrocchio as an artist. That he could be as spontaneous and ready as any one we have seen in his sketches of *putti*; but the two heads, for all their many and remarkable qualities, do not satisfy the highest expectations. We are left with the feeling that Vasari must be right; that Verrocchio's triumphs were hard-won. It would seem that he was more interesting as the precursor of Leonardo than as an artist on his own account.\*

## II

Just because Verrocchio was Leonardo's master, because he supplied Leonardo with his stock-in-trade of types and motives, the study of Verrocchio as the head of a school, as an influence, wins for us an interest that otherwise we should scarcely feel.

I must make my meaning clear, lest I be identified with those scholars who seem to think that the whole function of the student of art and letters is to trace the evolution of one artist from another. The development of types, forms, and motives is an interesting study; it is interesting also to see in what way a great artist is influenced by, or reacts against, the general evolution of types and motives going on in his day; but, though such research, even when scrupulously scientific—which it seldom is—may to some extent help us to understand the mettle of the man back of the artist, it is, in so far as the appreciation of the work of art is concerned, going North when you should be going South. And it is high time to protest, and insist that the chief interest of the student of art is in the enjoyment of the work of art, and not in its furnishing glosses for him whose concern is evolution, psychology, history, or anything else.

In the interest of the real appreciation of art, I could wish, however, that some student of evolution, applying himself to art for the last time, would reconstruct Verrocchio as an influence, and show to what extent Leonardo was indebted to his master for his types and motives. It would be found, I am sure, that this debt was great. But would the full realisation of this dependence help us to appreciate and enjoy Leonardo as an artist? No, for the term "artist," from the æsthetic, the only point of view we may admit, signifies nothing more nor less than a summation of works of art; and unless we have enjoyed and appreciated these, much though we may know about the man, his manners, his environment, his temperament, his anything you please, we shall know nothing of the artist.

\* It is needless here to enter into the question of the so-called Verrocchio Sketch-Book. Morelli's suggestions have been followed out, and the whole question summed up in the clearest, most scholarly style by Dr. Gronau in an article in the *Fährbücher der Preuss. Kunstsamm.* for 1896. Five designs for tabernacles in marble are certainly by the same hand, although unconnected with the sketch-book. One is in the collection of Lord Pembroke, at Wilton House; another is in the His de la Salle Collection [No. 119] of the Louvre. The other three are in the Uffizi, where they all pass under the name of Desiderio da Settignano, for the reason that one [No. 6150] is a sketch after that master's tabernacle at S. Lorenzo. The others are numbered 6140 and 6450.



To prove then, once for all, that the study of evolution is from the æsthetic point of view—in art the only admissible point of view—quite futile, I could wish for an opportunity to reconstruct Verrocchio and to trace his influence upon Leonardo. The task is not impossible; for, as in Leonardo Verrocchio had a pupil who soared far above him in genius, in Lorenzo di Credi he had a tame follower who lacked both wit and initiative to stray far either to right or to left. If Lorenzo differs from Verrocchio it is in quality, and not in types and motives. Translating back therefore, as we are justified in doing, Lorenzo's clumsiness and dulness into the quality of Verrocchio's known works, we shall have an adequate idea, not only of how the master may have treated such and such a theme, but, in all probability, how actually he did treat it. The task of translation, I may add, is not over-difficult, certainly not in Lorenzo's earlier works, in such, for instance, as the altar-piece in the Cathedral of Pistoja, or in the Annunciation with background of hall and garden in the Uffizi [No. 1160]—pictures where Credi had not yet fallen so despairingly behind his master.

Without permitting myself to make an adequate study of Credi for the light he might throw on his master Verrocchio, and on his great fellow-pupil's indebtedness to the same master, I yet will allow myself to touch upon this subject in passing, when we come to consider his drawings.

### III

But our attention must first be directed to a number of sketches by several older fellow-pupils of Credi, and first of all to a lovely woman's head in the Uffizi [No. 428], attributed to Leonardo, but correctly described by Morelli as a copy after Verrocchio. She is seen nearly in profile to left, with eyes almost closed, and the original was doubtless for a Virgin in an Annunciation. That that original was Verrocchio's appears from the type and the treatment of the hair. The lifelessness of the touch indicates that the head before us is a copy. That the copyist put into his version more prettiness than the original had is more than likely. But give this version due life and strenuousness, and we recapture something so rare and precious as a drawing by Verrocchio.

The genuine sketches of Verrocchio's school, exclusive of the so-called "Verrocchio Sketch-Book," betray three or four different hands. I begin with the most important group. It consists of four sheets,\* one with a head on each side, belonging to Herr von Beckerath of Berlin, another a study of drapery in the Malcolm Collection, and two further studies of drapery in the Uffizi.

The heads (for angels, by the way) are both in crayon, and are at present not only somewhat defaced but re-touched as well. One of them looks up open-mouthed to right, and this one has been pricked for transfer. In type, in features

\* For a fifth, at Oxford, see catalogue No. 2708.

and in forms it betrays a close connection with Verrocchio, and the Verrocchio of such a relatively early work as the much-discussed Berlin Madonna [No. 104<sup>a</sup>]. The quality, however, is not the master's. Here there is no adequate approach to the subtle modelling nor to the fine drawing which characterises that pungent work. There the hair has the movement of a thing not to be arrested; here—and this is partly the re-toucher's fault—it has the look of decaying weeds. The other head is but a fragment, showing the upper part only of the face, yet enough to demonstrate, despite its being more sketchy, a certain superiority over the first.

It is scarcely to be doubted that both these sketches were studies for the same work; and that they were also by the same hand. The names of such of Verrocchio's early assistants as might have done these fragments are unknown to me, but at least one of them is not without a certain artistic personality. I refer to the painter who helped Verrocchio in one of the finest achievements of his studio, the Madonna with two Angels of the National Gallery [No. 276]. Now there can be little doubt that this assistant, whatever his name, was the author of these heads. If we look in the picture at the angel to the right we shall find that, allowing for the differences inevitably arising between a slight sketch in crayon and elaborate execution in oils, the drawing of the pupils, the eyelids, and the nose is identical with the more fragmentary of Herr von Beckerath's heads. The other, if reversed, almost could be considered a study for Gabriel in the same painting, so close is the resemblance, not only in type and pose, but in the treatment of the hair. But the picture is of so much better quality, and shows such an advance also in expression, that we may safely conclude the crayon heads to have been done considerably earlier, when the painter in question had not yet attained to his full powers.

To this same follower of Verrocchio's earlier manner I am strongly tempted to ascribe the most archaic in arrangement, and one of the best in quality, of those enigmatic, frequently worthless, bits of drapery—most of them in umbre heightened with white, on dark grey coloured linen—found here and there all over Europe, and generally passing under Leonardo's name. The bit in question is, as I have said, in the Malcolm Collection [Plate xxvi.], and is a study for a kneeling Virgin for a picture of a Nativity which, if it exist, is unknown to me. The figure, which is cut off at the middle of the face, is outlined with the brush in a spirited, masterly fashion, but the artist's real concern was the mantle which he draped over the left shoulder, wrapped about the arm, and then allowed to fall and spread upon the ground. The folds are extremely angular, yet large and functional. The drawing and modelling contain nothing that Verrocchio or even Leonardo need have disowned. Yet I think neither of them could have been the author of this study. It is fairly clear, at all events, that its author was not Leonardo. His drapery, although angular enough at times, as for instance in the angel of the "*Vierge aux Rochers*," is never cut up into these large, almost rectangular folds. His type of woman was scarcely the somewhat massive female here outlined. Both the type and the folds are simply

too archaic for Leonardo, and widely divergent from even his earliest style.\* With Verrocchio, on the other hand, the points of contact are many; but numerous as they may be, each point of resemblance is foiled by a subtler point of contrast. I care not which of Verrocchio's works you choose for comparison: whether it be the Madonna in relief of S. Maria Nuova, so close to this in structure of figure, or the bronze group at Orsammichele, where the mantle of Christ is hung in much the same way; whether you look at the silver relief for the altar of S. Giovanni, or at any of the paintings that we all agree to assign to him—in no authenticated work, and in none even which has with any reason been ascribed to Verrocchio, shall we find draperies angular in precisely the way they are here, in this Malcolm study.

Just such draperies, however, we do find in the National Gallery picture already mentioned, and in yet two other Madonnas of similar character, one belonging to Mr. Charles Butler, and the other in Berlin [No. 108].† The folds in these paintings have the same singular combination of angularity with fine-edged line. They tend to fall into rectangles or to be drawn out into long loops. To describe the resemblance further would make me more tedious than even I care to be, while a moment's careful comparison of the works in question will convince the competent student that if the painter of the pictures be not the author of this piece of drapery, he at all events deserves this title better than any one else to whom, for the present, it might be assigned.

As for the two sketches in the Uffizi, it is not too rash perhaps to suppose that the same painter in his later degenerate phase was their author. The earlier and better is No. 437, drapery for a seated figure. No. 433, drapery for the lower part of an erect female figure, is even poorer than in the Frankfort Madonna, which it resembles.

A looser, much less vigorous hand but a more delicate feeling reveal themselves in another group of drawings, all in the Uffizi. The finest of them is a study [No. 445] for a Madonna adoring the Child, whom an angel holds on her lap, while the infant John, leaning against her on the other side, looks on smiling. His smile suggests Leonardo, but the Virgin has something of Botticelli's dolefulness. The Child is as uninteresting as if designed by Credi. In another study [No. 444] the Madonna is drawn with two heads. One looks out quietly, the other looks down tenderly upon the Child who sits on her right knee blessing. In yet another sketch [No. 443] the Madonna holds her hand to her breast, while the Child sits uneasily on her lap. The two last designs have great tenderness of feeling, but kept under firm restraint. Finally, one sheet [No. 212, Cat. II.] is more purely Verrocchiesque than the others. On one side we see the face of a

\* As we see it in the Louvre Annunciation [No. 1265], a work which seems to me beyond question by him, and painted in his earliest years, perhaps when he was only sixteen or seventeen.

† The difference between these pictures and the one in the National Gallery consists to my mind in there being much less of Verrocchio in the former, their execution being entirely the assistant's; whereas in the latter Verrocchio must have carefully superintended everything, and himself helped on the work. What this same gifted assistant finally came to, when left to his own resources, we may see, if I mistake not, in a Madonna at Frankfort [No. 9].



curly-headed girl, and on the other the upper part of a child copied from the one sitting up in Verrocchio's Louvre sheet of *putti*.

I have no clue to this draughtsman's identity. He certainly was neither Verrocchio nor Credi nor the author of the Sketch-Book. For the first he is too fumbling in quality and too modern in feeling. With the second he certainly has much in common, but he has neither his touch nor technique, and he shows much greater refinement. With the third, Francesco di Simone, he cannot be confounded. Nor can I connect him with any existing work of Verrocchio's school, although one is tempted to believe him to have been the author of Mr. Quincy Shaw's beautiful relief of the Madonna with an Angel.

A head for a Madonna in the Uffizi [No. 1254] almost in profile stands among drawings by itself, but unlike the sketches of the last group may with certainty be connected with a known painting of Verrocchio's following. The head in question was a study for a Virgin in a lovely picture representing the Madonna kneeling in Adoration in the collection of Lady Henry Somerset at Reigate. This picture, by the way, although overwhelmingly Verrocchiesque, was painted by a master who must have felt the spiritual if not the formal influence of Sandro Botticelli.

There are two studies for the drapery of the lower part of a figure kneeling in profile to right, presumably an angel. One is in the Uffizi [No. 420] and the other in the Louvre, and they differ but slightly from each other. Both are ascribed to Leonardo, as all drawings on linen indiscriminately are. They are, however, by some other pupil of Verrocchio's, and, if I mistake not, by that one who assisted the master either in the drapery of the angel usually believed Leonardo's in the Baptism, or in the drapery of Gabriel in the Uffizi Annunciation also ascribed to Leonardo. Could one demonstrate that the drawings before us were Leonardo's, he would strengthen the ancient and still current tradition regarding the two paintings. But I believe such demonstration to be improbable.

Four further drawings in the Uffizi form yet another group, and are closely related, if not actually by the same hand.

The most interesting of them is a sheet [No. 131] sketched with great spirit, containing on the one side a number of nudes in various attitudes and three *putti*, one of them an infant John, and, on the other side, an uneasily reclining female nude, an eagle, and a seated male nude. Certainly there are close affinities between this sheet and Francesco di Simone's drawings. Thus, the reclining figure is found with certain variations on one of the latter's leaflets at Hamburg. But our author has far more dash and even purpose than ever Francesco had.

Perhaps a sheet [No. 125] with one woman's and two children's heads is by the same hand. They are Verrocchiesque, but the female has something of Botticelli in his "Primavera" phase. Another child's head [No. 124] is closely connected with the last, and the same hand again may be held responsible for a leaflet [No. 217] containing charming studies for a Madonna and Child.

In more than one of these drawings of Verrocchio's school we have noted a

certain indescribable yet insidious Botticellian influence. We now come to a sketch where that influence makes itself strongly felt although here also it is scarcely to be perceived, either in the types or even the forms, which remain Verrocchiesque. Yet few designs not actually of Sandro's school are more impregnated with his spirit than this sketch [Uffizi, No. 212]. It is of a Venus pensively reclining on a flowered meadow, while Cupid touches her bosom lightly, as he merrily starts out with his bow and quiver, on his heart-rending sport. A motive like this did not arise independently of such an one as Sandro's Venus and Mars. But who was its author? I leave the answer to others.

## IV

In the National Gallery there is a picture of Tobias and the Angel [No. 781] assigned to the Tuscan School, which has singular affinities with the Verrocchiesque Madonna and Angels of the same collection. In no feature, however, are the two works so like to one another as in the treatment of the draperies. Leave quality out of consideration and they almost are identical.

Similar as in many respects these two pictures are, they are nevertheless by different hands. The Tobias and the Angel may perhaps be ascribed to Francesco Botticini. This painter of moderate attainments would scarcely merit our attention were it not that the likeness of his name to Botticelli's, and his slavish dependence for a time on his more renowned contemporaries, particularly on Verrocchio, have led to the confusion of his works with theirs. Space will not allow me to speak of him at length, and happily I can dispense with the task, as Francesco Botticini has been treated recently by Signor Cavalcaselle in the seventh volume of the Italian version of his monumental history. What Signor Cavalcaselle has left unsaid, and it is considerable, will soon be more than supplemented by the elaborate study which Mr. Herbert P. Horne intends publishing on Botticini. Meanwhile Mr. Horne has been good enough to communicate to me many of his results and discoveries, and among them are all the drawings of which I am about to speak.\*

There are in the British Museum three separate sheets of elaborately finished drawings in bistre and white for a Coronation of the Virgin. On one is represented Christ holding up the crown [Plate xxvii.]; on the other the Madonna with arms folded in humble reverence over her breast [Plate xxviii.]; in the third are two music-making angels dancing upon clouds. That Mr. Horne is correct in attributing these studies to Botticini will, I think, be questioned by no one who is acquainted with this painter's authenticated works at Empoli, and such others as by clear deduction from these may be safely assigned to him. The types, the hair with its waving

\* For a list of Botticini's more interesting pictures, see the second edition of my "Florentine Painters."

yet somewhat metallic curls, the draperies, billowy and either churned up or angular, the form of hand, are all his. Here, however, we have him in an exceptionally early phase. We know from Neri di Bicci's diary that Botticini, then twelve years old, became his pupil in 1459.\* The earliest dated work of those which on internal evidence can be assigned to him, is the Crucifixion with Tobias and the Angel and Saints at Berlin, executed in 1475. This shows clearly that Botticini, after leaving Neri di Bicci, must have worked chiefly under Cosimo Rosselli, that later he must have studied Castagno, and that, just about 1475, he was turning his attention to Verrocchio, whose assistant he must actually have become soon afterwards. The drawings in the British Museum betray no trace of Verrocchio's influence, nor even of Castagno's. In the angels Neri di Bicci's types are easily recognised. Now as Neri's types occur scarcely ever again in Botticini's works, he must have outgrown them completely after a certain time, and these angels, and the companion drawings, would therefore belong to the earlier part of this painter's career.

A tolerable craftsman, easily bending to minds stronger than his own, must have been just the sort of painter to be employed by a man on the outlook for some one to execute slavishly his own ideas. Matteo Palmieri certainly employed Botticini and not Botticelli to paint for him that elaborately thought-out Coronation of the Virgin† which the suspicion of heresy soon rendered famous. The date of its execution can scarcely be later than 1475, the year of Palmieri's death. But it must be somewhat earlier, for it shows none but the slightest traces of Verrocchio's influence, and this influence, as we have noted, was in 1475 already beginning to be strongly felt. We shall then scarcely stray far from the truth in supposing that this work was painted soon after 1470. This would allow ample time for the planning and execution of the picture, which may indeed be regarded as a sort of frontispiece to Palmieri's *Città di Vita*, finished early in 1464.

The manuscript of this famous poem dated 1473, which Palmieri handed over to the Guild of Notaries, is now in the Laurentian Library at Florence. Here and there it contains coloured figures of angels, and at the end, what is more to our purpose, a medallion in pen and ink of Matteo Palmieri, all, as Mr. Horne pointed out to me, by Botticini. And in truth, the medallion has this petty artist's niggling, but just tolerable touch.

## V

Before discussing Lorenzo di Credi's qualities and achievement as a draughtsman, we must devote attention to three or four drawings, not always accepted as his, which he must have made while he still was working with Verrocchio. Two

\* Vasari, "Sansoni," ii. p. 87.

† Now in the National Gallery [No. 1126]. Everything of interest concerning this picture will be discussed by Mr. Horne in his forthcoming book on Botticelli.



of them indeed have been defended by Morelli as the latter's, but with more zeal than persuasiveness.

The earlier, perhaps, of this couple is at Dresden, and is the bust of a youngish woman. When the artist had nearly completed this figure it occurred to him to add the vague form of a child. Still unsatisfied, he placed over this child the head of another. In this last arrangement, the design before us could pass as a preliminary study for a pleasant but tentative Madonna and Child, belonging to M. Gustave Dreyfus of Paris.

This small picture is Verrocchiesque without being Andrea's, and I know no pupil of that master who so easily could justify a claim to its authorship as Lorenzo. The child certainly seems his. Much else is not so surely his; but here we are in the presence, not of an independent work, but of one executed for the master, and under his direction.

"The more reason then for ascribing the design for it to Verrocchio," I hear some one say. Certainly; but the drawing is pitifully fumbling and paltry. Morelli says it is of the same blood as the Malcolm head. Yes; but debased and thinned. Doubtless the author of this feeble figure had that head, or another similar one, before him to copy. He did it badly: the eyes are out of drawing; the neck is shapeless. As his model had no bust, he added one, draping it, however, in a way that is not purely Verrocchiesque. The folds betray a new element. While it is possible that Credi himself introduced this new element, we must not forget that he had for older fellow pupil Leonardo, and it is not unlikely that the newness was due to the latter. Be it observed, moreover, that the draping of the bust recalls the noted Madonna at Munich, ascribed to Leonardo.

This panel was the subject of embittered controversy between the late Signor Morelli and the late Dr. Bayersdorffer, the latter contending that it was a genuine work by the young Leonardo, the former that it was an impudent Flemish *cento*. My own impression is that both combatants may have been in the right. The picture would seem a copy—and to pacify an irritated spirit, we may grant that the copyist was a Fleming—a copy, then, after an original executed in Verrocchio's shop, under the inspiration and guidance of Leonardo, by Lorenzo di Credi.

On this hypothesis, the Dresden drawing would have served as a preliminary study for the original of the Munich picture, as well as for the one belonging to M. Dreyfus. Elaborate the drapery on the right, add the Leonardesque coil below, and take away the lower child, and you have all but the background\* of the former panel. Leave Credi more to himself, and he sticks closer to our drawing and produces the Madonna in Paris. Morelli connected still another work with this design, a Madonna and Infant John at Dresden [No. 13], which, however, he ascribed to still another Fleming. I am not ready to deny too vigorously his

\* The mountain shapes seen through the window are a difficulty to some students who know that Leonardo never had them before his arrival at Milan. In that case we should have to grant that the "Flemish" copyist changed the landscape and introduced the later forms.

contention that the execution of the picture in question was due to a Northern hand; but I must add that, if the singularly hard outlines and stupid draperies lend a colouring to Morelli's views, the cartoon must nevertheless have been Credi's. The two children, and the Madonna's hand, are completely his. Considering how uncertain Credi's first steps were, it is perhaps safer to leave him this work. At all events, his masterpiece, and perhaps earliest completely independent work, the Madonna at Turin [No. 356], is but a variation played on the same theme.

Thus the three pictures which may be connected with the Dresden drawing all point to Credi, and we may safely assume that the drawing also was his handiwork.\*

The other drawing which Morelli assigned to Verrocchio instead of Credi is a sketch in the British Museum for the angel, uppermost on the right, upholding the *mandorla* in the Fortiguerrri monument at Pistoja [Plate xxix.]. As we know from documents published by Gaye, and more recently by Chiti†, Verrocchio undertook this tomb in 1477, and in July 1483 he declared it all but finished, and requested payment on account. Verrocchio did not live to see the task done, and in 1511 its completion was submitted to Lorenzo Lotti. Lotti undertook not only to furbish up and put in place what already existed, but to add the Cardinal, the Charity, and the *putti* above and below the sarcophagus.

A careful inspection of the monument in its present state, leads one to agree in general with the statement in the contract of 1511. It is easy to perceive that the Charity and the bust, as well as the *putti* with the torches, are by later hands. Lotti seems, moreover, to have done on the original models the cherub under the Saviour's feet, and to have finished the head of the Faith. All the other figures were executed in the workshop of Verrocchio.

But by whom? Certainly not by the master himself. He seems to have limited his share in this work to mere superintendence, for neither the terra-cotta model for the entire monument, nor the British Museum drawing for the angel, are by him. Sculpture is not my province, and I must be cautious in making suggestions which may be given more than their due. Yet I venture to say that the model may be Lorenzo di Credi's. That he was sculptor no less than painter we infer from Verrocchio's recommendation to the lords of Venice to let Lorenzo complete the statue of Colleoni. The smoothly flowing draperies in the terra-cotta sketch accord with Credi's manner better than with that of any other of his fellow pupils. The heads might well be his, in his earliest phase. Presently I shall come to still further reasons for ascribing it to him. But, whoever may have been the author of this model, he must have submitted it to Verrocchio, who thereupon suggested certain changes. These we now see in the finished work, but they

\* In the Uffizi there is a drawing [No. 1197] for the Child in the Munich picture. It is ascribed to Credi, but is probably a contemporary copy by a pupil after either Credi's original drawing, or, as is more likely, after the original painting. And copy though it is, it yet is far better in expression, at least, than the Child in the Munich panel.

† Gaye, "Carteggio," i. 256; Chiti, in "Bulletino Storico Pistoiese," i. 45.

must first have been embodied in a second model, which was still existing in June 1511, when Lotti undertook to follow it scrupulously in completing the tomb. This model was not identical with the S. Kensington sketch, for the document specifies that in the former there were two *putti* with shields below the sarcophagus, and two others with torches above it. Of all this there is no trace in the extant model.

On the second model, then, the greater part of the monument was finished by July 1483. Looking carefully at the draperies, at the heads, and the hands of the purely Verrocchiesque figures, I come to the conclusion that for the execution also Credi chiefly must be held responsible.

That he from the first must have had the task in his hands we may infer from the British Museum study for the angel. Neither its quality nor its mannerisms permit its attribution to Verrocchio, although, as is natural, everything here is very close to him. But this hand, these feet, these folds of drapery, could not easily be more characteristic of Credi. Being his, why should he have drawn this angel, after having on the same sheet rapidly sketched the same attitude as struck by the living figure? Why, unless it was he who was to prepare the model?

I now return to the S. Kensington terra-cotta. There is greater agreement between the angel there and the one in the drawing than there is between the latter and the angel finally executed. In the drawing, moreover, there is a cast of drapery that we have not noted hitherto. It is a cast of drapery to sweep around a waist. It has no resemblance to the drapery about the Saviour's waist in the marble, but the likeness of identity almost with the equivalent folds in the S. Kensington sketch. We thus are justified in assuming that the model was made after the drawing, and not improbably by the same hand.

This procedure of the Fortiguerra monument would seem to find a parallel, and hence a confirmation, in another work executed for Pistoja, the Madonna with the Baptist and S. Zanobi. A document of 1485\* says that Verrocchio, to whom the work had been allotted, had it nearly ready, and would have finished it six and more years earlier if payment had then been forthcoming. It is quite a similar story to that of the Fortiguerra monument, with the difference that, while the latter achievement has never, to my knowledge at least, been connected with Credi, the picture has, since Vasari at any rate, almost universally been ascribed to him. Nevertheless, there actually may be more of Verrocchio's own handiwork in the panel than in the marbles. We shall see.

In the His de la Salle Collection of the Louvre there is a study for the Baptist in the Pistoja picture. The quality, the style, and the technique point to Credi as its certain author. That it is no copy after the figure in the picture may be inferred from two considerations. In the first place, the differences are considerable, not in the pose and action, which are identical, but in the draperies, and in the character and expression of the head. In the second place, the head in the

\* Chiti, *op. cit.*



drawing is more hard-visaged and more Pollajuolesque than in the painting. In other words, one head represents an earlier phase of the master's and thus of the pupil's development than the other. The drawing is therefore earlier, and considerably earlier than the painting. It was probably made when the picture was ordered in 1478, while the figure in the painting may not have been finished till after 1485.

The differences between the drawing and the painting may be accounted for along the same lines as we pursued in explaining the differences between the model and the marbles of the tomb. In the one case as in the other, the entire task may have been left to Credi. He drew this figure of the Baptist and submitted it to the master. Perhaps the work went no further for some time. When taken up again, the master suggested, and perhaps made with his own hand, certain changes. I say "with his own hand," for I find the Baptist in the painting greatly superior, not only to the drawing but to the rest of the painting, and to any other picture that can safely be ascribed to Credi. I seem to observe in that one figure of the Baptist a largeness and puissance of modelling, and in the head a character that I can account for only on the supposition that Verrocchio himself had greatly co-operated on this figure.

If the few sketches we have examined just now have been correctly ascribed, and if the inferences we have drawn from them are correct, we have succeeded in throwing some faint glimmer of light on Credi's beginnings as well as on Verrocchio's later career. With one exception, the drawings to which we now shall turn are concerned with Credi only. That exception is not without interest. The study in question (in the Malcolm Collection) is an elaborate one for the drapery covering the lower part of a seated figure. By itself of no extreme interest, it owes its importance to its connection with another design in the Louvre [No. 389], there attributed, and correctly, it would seem, to Leonardo. We shall have more to say of this in its proper place. Here it suffices to note that the one is a faithful copy of the other, and that, as Leonardo is not likely to have copied Credi, we must suppose that Credi copied Leonardo.\* We may assume also that Credi is never again so likely to have had the original in his hands as while he and Leonardo were still together in Verrocchio's workshop. This Louvre study of drapery would thus be one of the earliest of the great master's extant drawings.

But to return to Credi. We already have touched upon his activity as a sculptor. After his master's decease he must have turned more and more away from this art, or the tradition, as embodied in Vasari, would not so entirely have forgotten that he ever had been a sculptor. But further traces of this pursuit, although rare, are not wanting in his career, and this is perhaps as fit a place as

\* In this connection note the following in the first paragraph of Vasari's "Life of Credi": "And because Lorenzo took great delight in the manner of Leonardo, he learned to imitate him so well that, in neatness and meticulousness of finish, no one could imitate him better. And this you may see in many drawings made with the stylus, and the pen, or wash which are in our book. Among them are certain ones, done after earthen models contrived of oiled linen and liquid earth. . . ."—Vasari, iv. p. 564.

another to make brief mention of one or two of the more important instances. The most important is a very detailed design in pen and ink at the Uffizi [No. 1436, Plate xxxii.] for a chapel in the form of an elaborately sculptured triumphal arch, with a painted Annunciation over the altar. Ascribed to Francesco di Giorgio, this sheet has been assigned by Morelli to Credi's school, and had this critic known the master better, I doubt not he would have given it to Credi himself. Indeed, it is not unworthy of him in his earlier and better phase. A careful comparison with Lorenzo's other studies done lightly with the pen, will, I trust, establish this conclusion. It should be noted that the Annunciation has the closest affinities with the one at the Uffizi [No. 1160]—one of Lorenzo's very earliest independent works—than which however it must be a trifle earlier, for in the pen-sketch the angel is most singularly Leonardesque.

The only other design by Credi for sculpture that we need speak of here is in the Louvre, and of later date and slighter interest than the last, although far from unpleasant in arrangement. Under a canopy, the curtains of which are held back by ribbons, we see, standing on the cover of a circular vase, Justice between Force and Temperance. Under the base two *putti* hold a shield between them.

And now at last we can turn to the more general consideration of Credi's drawings.

## VI

In his drawings Lorenzo di Credi is always Lorenzo di Credi, but, in better moments, he is perhaps not quite so unpalatable as in the mass of his paintings. Like a true weakling of an artist, he was best when doing a head, and some of his young people are dainty and fresh, and his old men are not without character. Lorenzo would seem to have lacked not so much a certain vision of beauty, as the power to communicate it with spirit and life-enhancing energy. The waxen, fleckless finish he sought to give his paintings shows itself in these drawings also, but with a touch not quite so frigid.

In quality of actual execution, I should be inclined to place first a laurel-wreathed head of almost epicene sex belonging to M. Gustave Gruyer of Paris. The black chalk is used in a way that reminds us of Verrocchio's head in the Malcolm Collection, and the luxuriant curls have a certain life of their own, not Leonardo's of course, but not altogether unworthy of one who was his fellow pupil. Even the modelling has a certain charm, and the drawing of the mouth is the feature of the sketch Verrocchio would have been least ashamed of. Lorenzo is here closer to his master than we shall ever find him again.

Next to this, for charm, I should place the very pretty, exquisitely neat drawings of large-eyed, sweet-looking girls and boys. An example of the first kind is the head of a maiden in the Louvre [No. 203] which reminds one of Burne-

Jones' drawings, not only in its limpidity of spirit and daintiness of touch, but in its very weaknesses. Of the boys' heads the Louvre also has the best specimen [No. 202]. It is the bust of a sentimental stripling, with a look of Narcissus-like languor which only his fresh youthfulness renders endurable. The execution is coquettishly dainty, and finished off rather smartly—with the smartness, let us say, of a lady's maid giving a last touch to her mistress's bow-knot.

This bust reminds us of a painting which until the other day passed as Credi's, the delightful youth by Perugino in the Uffizi [No. 1217]. The pose is nearly the same, and in the conception there certainly is more than enough to suggest to the happy-go-lucky connoisseurship of the good old times, identity of authorship. For us, the likeness is a proof of identity of school rather than of hand, and tends further to establish the fact, scarcely ever denied, but never sufficiently considered, that Perugino also grew to mastery under Verrocchio. It is by no means impossible, however, that Credi, besides drawing from the same source as Perugino, did not disdain to follow, along with Fra Bartolommeo, Bugiardini, and many another Florentine, in the lead of the great Umbrian.\* Such an imitation of the kindred Pietro, but this time in his bolder, almost blustering spirit—the phase wherein he painted the portrait of Francesco dell' Opera [Uffizi, No. 287]—we may perhaps detect in certain other of Lorenzo's heads, as for instance the proud long-haired youth of the Uffizi [No. 111, Cornice 83], or the smooth-faced old man in the Malcolm Collection [No. 25]. Pietro's own face, somewhat kindlier than usual, looks out at us, if I mistake not, from another of Credi's drawings in the Uffizi [No. 237, Cornice 82]. Close in spirit and in technique, yet somewhat aloof from the rest of Credi's quasi-Peruginesque heads, stands the one in the Louvre [No. 199] of an oldish man [Plate xxx.]. It is the finest of the series, for its careful yet not too detailed modelling, and for a certain touch of life in the crayon line. In still other heads Lorenzo seems to have had in mind Ghirlandajo's downright style of portraiture; and of this kind are the very matter-of-fact heads of an old Florentine burgess at Windsor, and the one in the Duke of Devonshire's Collection at Chatsworth of a craftier elderly man, apparently Mino da Fiesole.

It is a pity for Credi's fame as an artist that none of the portraits for which the heads just mentioned were studies have come down to our day. For his small gifts of imagination, sacred or historical painting was too ambitious a task, but the power revealed in his sketches of mapping out a face, and his careful technique, must have rendered him an excellent contriver of—if one may say so—enlarged miniatures. A study of his drawings has thus far, then, tended to slightly increase our estimate of Lorenzo's modest talents. Further study of his sketches will scarcely impair his fame, and may perhaps further heighten it.

Apart from the heads, Credi's remaining drawings are chiefly for Madonnas, or designs of drapery. Scarcely an exception is the fine study for an allegory of

\* Perugino's influence on his younger contemporaries at Florence was of a kind to merit far more study than has ever been given to the subject.



Astronomy in the Uffizi [No. 493]. The figure is of Verrocchio's type, well seated, queenly, and, although not free from weaknesses, fairly well done, but the draughtsman's chief interest here was nevertheless in the draperies. The studies and cartoons for Madonnas are not to be described with enthusiasm. Even the one with the Child blessing [Uffizi, No. 555], although sweet, unhackneyed, and refined, has no specific quality to recommend it. Nor are the various sketches of drapery much more interesting. The one in the Louvre [No. 206] for the St. Bartholomew, at Orsammichele, according to Vasari an early work, is, despite its elaboration in colours, a dull performance [Plate xxxi.], and the various other pieces, except a few in pen and ink, of which I shall speak later, are, at all events, not less dull.

## VII

Such pupils of Lorenzo di Credi as Sogliani will occupy us later; for the present just a word or two about earlier drawings of his school. Of copies one need scarcely speak, for even Lorenzo's originals are of small interest.

Among works which, until the other day, used to pass as Credi's, Morelli has distinguished a small group which he correctly ascribes to a follower whom he has designated as "Tommaso." The designation is unfortunate, for Tommaso di Stefano, born according to Vasari in 1496, could have been Lorenzo's pupil only after the first decade of the sixteenth century, whereas the painter of the group in question is on the whole a pure Quattrocentist. "Tommaso," moreover, is known to us by at least one work, authenticated by Vasari, the Nativity, in the Chapel of the Villa Capponi at Arcetri. This picture could not possibly have been painted by the hand responsible for the group executed by Morelli's "Tommaso."

The earliest work of this series is a tondo of a Nativity in the Uffizi [No. 1287]. Here "Tommaso" is very close to Lorenzo, but is not so tame in expression, and more fascinating in his effects of light. In the Borghese tondo of a Nativity [No. 439] he has travelled further, but he still betrays that his source was Lorenzo in such a phase as we find him in his Nativity [No. 94] at the Florence Academy. Still later is the pleasant allegorical figure of a female in a niche, exhibited in the Refectory of S. Salvi. "Tommaso" in his last manner, thoroughly decadent, appears in yet another tondo of the Nativity, this time in the Pitti [No. 354]. He should be described as a pupil of Credi's, who fell more and more under the influence of Piero di Cosimo.<sup>†</sup>

\* "Le Galleria Borghese," &c., p. 85 *et seq.*

† Possibly this "Tommaso" was Giovanni Cianfanini (1462-1542), who in 1480 was working with Botticelli, and ten years later collaborating with Credi [Vasari, "Sansoni," iv. p. 200, note 1]. With Credi he seems to have remained on excellent terms to the end.

The cause of our concern with him here is a drawing in the Uffizi [No. 431] in umbre washed with white on fine linen—of a material therefore which hitherto has sufficed to justify an attribution to Leonardo, to whom it is still ascribed. It is the head of a woman bent down to the right, and is doubtless a study for a Madonna in yet another Nativity—a subject apparently "Tommaso's" "cypress." Although this head does not absolutely correspond with any one in any picture of "Tommaso's" that I have in mind, yet there is such general identity in type and mannerism that its attribution to him will scarcely be questioned. I may add that this sketch belongs to his middle rather than to his earliest years.

It is not improbable that study of this head and of the paintings by the same hand may lead to a still further restoration to "Tommaso" of drawings ascribed to Leonardo.

It then would seem that his also was the study in the Uffizi [No. 432] of a child, in the same materials as the last. On the back of the same there are more rapid sketches for a Madonna and Child. Although more graceful and more spirited, there is no reason for doubting that the front and back are by the same hand. The front is clearly "Tommaso's." If the back is his also, then his again must be a pleasant study in the same materials, belonging to Herr von Beckerath, for a youthful St. Luke. He is seated draped in a mantle leaving his right shoulder bare, and turning gently to a pretty angel who hovers in the air. Meanwhile he keeps his left hand on the open book in which he has just been reading or writing. The contours here are so singularly identical with those of the sketches on the back of the last mentioned piece, that I can scarcely doubt the identity of hand. A comparison of the folds with the draperies in "Tommaso's" paintings strengthens my belief.

The same touch, although a trifle coarser, appears in a larger drawing in the same materials, a study in the Uffizi [No. 422] for a Madonna. She sits almost in profile to left with the Child on her right knee. It is true that in neither type nor expression does she bear a striking resemblance to any of "Tommaso's" hitherto identified pictures. But the treatment of the contours is so close to Herr von Beckerath's sketch, and the draperies so well permit the attribution to "Tommaso," that I venture to believe that this Madonna also may be his.

## CHAPTER IV

### FRA FILIPPO AND BOTTICELLI

THE devotion to swift, rhythmical line, cultivated in the Trecento by those of Giotto's followers who failed to understand the purpose of their master's treatment of draperies (in which treatment they, for their part, could discern nothing more than an opportunity for calligraphy) hardened into a tradition, which, despite the destructive hordes of Naturalism, held its own throughout the fifteenth century. True, it was with diminished forces, but among the captains were Fra Filippo and Botticelli—hosts in themselves. Even their successors, Filippino and Raffaellino, were men of talent; but talent was not enough, and it would have required genius to force through the serried ranks of Michelangelo's followers an interest in line for its own sake, however vital and refined. The tradition perished, but Florentine painting did not long survive it.

The heritage of line for line's sake was transmitted from the fourteenth to the fifteenth century, not, as one might perhaps have expected, through Fra Angelico, whose more gifted followers quickly went over to the Naturalists, but through another and somewhat older monastic painter, Don Lorenzo Monaco. But Don Lorenzo must have been by education more Sienese than Florentine, and as a Florentine, he was the follower of that master who more than any other painter at Florence had felt the influence of the Sienese—Agnolo Gaddi.

The great successors of Duccio, Simone Martini and the Lorenzetti, however, did not, as did Giotto's pupils, cultivate line because of a misunderstanding, but out of a full appreciation of its possibilities, not only as an element by itself of greatest decorative value, but, more still, as the sole instrument wherewith to render the roundness and the ever shifting contours of the figure.\* No later Sienese, not even his Quattrocento reincarnation, Neroccio di Landi, realised all

\* The artistic purpose of the Sienese in the Trecento was thus identical with that of the Chinese and Japanese artists at all times. And as a given purpose and a given method in art are bound to select out of the visual universe only those elements that they can deal with, or must, if necessary, altogether create such elements, it follows that identity of aim will lead not only to identity of treatment, but even to a resemblance in types. This has not failed to take place in the case of the Sienese and the Sino-Japanese artists. I know whole compositions in fresco as well as on panel, by Sienese painters, which are Japanese not only in lineal effect, not only in action, but even in the faces, to the very cut of the almond-shaped eyes, the sharp noses, and the small full-lipped mouths.



the capacities of line as Simone did. A Florentine, Sandro Botticelli, was destined to be his real heir and his equal. And the inheritance fell into the hands of one who was not without direct ties of artistic kinship, for the patriarch of the Florentine linealists in the fifteenth century, was, as I have just said, Lorenzo Monaco, a grandson, in art, of Simone Martini.

Lorenzo's descendants remained faithful to his teaching, but not without a hard struggle, and not without surrendering much to the enemy and learning from him still more. Even the first of them, Fra Filippo, felt quickly that the day of mere calligraphy was over. He daily strove to express in terms of pure line the form which Masaccio had taught him to feel, but his success was rare. As a rule he wavered between attempting to vie with Masaccio, in which he succeeded about as well as Taddeo Gaddi did in rivalling Giotto, and falling back to Gothic scrawls with his bunchy, billowy, at times quite meaningless draperies.

Sandro Botticelli seemed for a time to have cast behind him all that he had learnt from Fra Filippo. In some of his earlier paintings you would think him a hardened naturalist. But temperament and early habits soon drew him back to the linealists, and then it proved that his bondage had not been fruitless; for under Pollajuolo he had learned to feel form and function as the jovial Friar never could have taught them. Sandro became the greatest perhaps of European linealists. His line, as mere swirl, as mere flow, as mere rhythm, is at least as fascinating as any in existence, while, at the same time it nearly always is functional, nearly always gives expression to an endlessly subtle, exquisitely felt sense for form in movement.

Botticelli had no successors worthy of him. Filippino fell back to the faults of his father, and swaddled up his thoroughly baroque figures in fold upon fold of blankets, thus producing the cruellest caricature of his own father's and of Botticelli's treatment of draperies. His fellow pupil, on whom he exerted a great and far from beneficent influence, Raffaellino del Garbo, was scarcely better, and not so strong.

In a school of linealists we should expect the drawings—where line must find greater opportunity than in painting—to be on the whole of a finer quality than the finished works. This is decidedly the case with the weaker men whom we shall presently approach. The pen-sketches of Filippino often have merits that we shall seek for in vain among his pictures. It is natural also that such a school should prefer the pen to any other instrument, although it used them all. Then a certain interest attaches to the fact that just as in painting—until the riper days of Filippino at all events—the technique of the school remained almost unchanged, so in drawing it walked no less faithfully in the ways of Fra Filippo.

## II

I have been able to find but three drawings which may pass unquestioned as Fra Filippo's, and all three are from his last years. One of them is of an authenticity which few paintings, and almost no drawings can boast. It is appended to a letter, as a sketch to give an idea of the picture which Fra Filippo was writing about. The work in question was presented by the Medici to Alfonso of Naples, and was still existing when Vasari wrote, but has since then disappeared. The letter is autograph, signed in full by Fra Filippo, and dated July 20, 1457.\* The original is now in the Florentine archives.

The drawing is of a triptych in a highly ornate Gothic frame [Plate xxxiii]. In the middle panel we see the Virgin kneeling in adoration of the Holy Child, who stretches out His arms towards her. Two angels kneel behind Him, and in the panels to right and to left are St. Michael, and some monastic saint. The affair of a moment, this slight sketch gives a rare insight into the artist's readiness of hand. The pen has passed over the paper like a breeze, yet left behind it traces not only sufficient to evoke a complete work of art, but to endow it with all the winsome charm and all the peculiar waywardness of Filippo's style. Here we see nothing but the full freedom of the linealist, untrammelled by aspirations foreign to his temperament, and to his earliest habits. Here also we find a prophecy of Botticelli's pen drawings. It is the same series of significant touches which, though interrupted in line, is perfectly continuous in function and movement, that we shall find in Sandro's illustrations for Dante's "*Divina Commedia*." Here we see clearly—clearer perhaps than anywhere else—whence Botticelli derived his art.

The two remaining drawings do not enjoy such an obvious authenticity, but are, I think, almost equally beyond the reach of reasonable doubt. One is a large sketch with pen and wash of bistre, heightened with white, on a purplish background for the scene on the middle of the north wall in the choir at Prato, representing St. Stephen exorcising a demon [Plate xxxiv.]. As in the fresco, we see the young Saint stooping to bless the writhing demoniac; whereupon the sportive imp of Satan makes good his retreat, while one of the bystanders throws up his hands in pious wonder, and the other looks away with the impudence of a saucy serving-maid. A comparison with the finished work is instructive. There Filippo's humour—the renowned humour of the Florentine guttersnipe—has been hushed down to the sanctity of the place. In the sketch Stephen's cranium is the flatter, more monkish one which Lippi most naturally affected, while in the fresco the Saint's head is taller and more refined. In no other feature, however, does the sketch have such

\* See Cavalcaselle's "*Storia delle Pitture in Italia*," v. 163, for a transliteration, and all that is known regarding the contents.

advantage over the fresco as in the treatment of the draperies. Here the folds are copious, yet not meaningless. They follow and interpret the action in every movement, as you will see in studying the folds taken by Stephen's dress as he stoops over the demoniac. In the fresco all this subtle realisation of movement is lost under summary lines, which mark rather than reveal action. The writhing of the madman also has lost its artistic value under a meaningless piece of cloth. For my part, I cannot believe that Filippo, even in his most careless moods, could have committed such blunders. They are due to the assistant's hand, here, in all probability, Fra Diamante's. Now, for an instant, let us look at this Hamburg drawing, quite on its own merits. The pictorial effect, whether as plasticity or as colour, is not easily rivalled in Florentine draughtsmanship. There is a splendid freedom in the bistre line, and every touch of white has its moulding, creative purpose. The vision of form is not of the highest, nor is the line of the purest, yet in perhaps no other work of Filippo's hand are we made to feel, as here, his kinship in art with the aged Donatello. This sketch reveals what a great artist this monk, *malgré lui*, might have been, had he had the character to rise above rather than to fall below his spontaneous successes.

The remaining drawing is one in the Malcolm Collection, and is scarcely inferior to the last. It represents an elderly woman seen in profile to right, standing in an attitude of awed supplication [Plate xxxv]. The artistic effect is nearly the same, although here it is attained with the silver point and not with bistre. The figure of the old woman, wrapt from head to foot in her mantle, is realised nearly to perfection, and her pose could scarcely be better rendered. The folds everywhere express the structure and interpret the action. It clearly belongs to Fra Filippo's later years, but among his still extant works of that period we shall not succeed in finding a figure so essentially artistic.

### III

On the back of the noble design we have just examined, we may see a sketch for an erect figure of one of those burgesses of great weight whose portraits stuff rather than adorn many Florentine frescoes. Like the sketch on the front, it is a study chiefly of drapery. There, however, the folds are characterised by great simplicity and dignity. Here their flow is hemmed and broken, and almost lost in aimless meanderings. A like inferiority appears in the structure of the body and in the drawing of the hands. We may safely conclude that Filippo was not the author of this sketch of a burgess. But if not Filippo himself, the draughtsman must have been his pupil and faithful follower, and the name of Fra Diamante inevitably occurs to one.

Fra Diamante seems to have worked constantly with Fra Filippo during the last twenty years at least of that artist's life, and to have shared all its vicissitudes.



A careful study of the works both on panel and fresco undertaken in that period by the master, reveals, in all but few of them, the pervasive presence of a pupil's hands, and, in a certain number, nothing but that pupil's hand. And we have no reason to doubt that that hand was Fra Diamante's.

The panels at Prato, all ascribed to Filippo, which we may venture to attribute to Diamante are a Madonna with the Baptist St. Stephen and Donors, a Nativity, and a "Madonna della Cintola" in the Gallery; the upper part of the Funeral of St. Jerome (the lower part of which is by Filippo himself) and an Annunciation both in the Pieve; the Circumcision at the Spirito Santo, and a St. Jerome between the Baptist and St. Thecla formerly in the Carmine. He also must be held responsible for the execution of most of the frescoes at Spoleto, such as the Annunciation, the Dormition and the foreground figures in the Nativity.

If we compare our drawing of a burgess, with the wriggling folds of his draperies and his feeble boneless hands, with figures here and there and everywhere among the works I have just mentioned, we shall perhaps not hesitate to adopt the idea which suggested itself so naturally, namely that Fra Diamante was the author of the sketch.

A drawing in the Uffizi of a head for a Madonna in profile to right may also be by him. The profile in question has distinct affinities with the female heads in the various works that we have thought of attributing to Fra Diamante. Two other sheets in the Uffizi ascribed to Filippino may also be his, but in a later, more independent, and therefore cruder phase. One [No. 673] is the study for a Visitation, wherein St. Elizabeth is reminiscent of the elderly figure by Filippo in the Malcolm Collection; the other [No. 674] is the sketch of a saint seated in profile to left reading at his desk.

In his earlier years—certainly not much after the middle of his career—Fra Filippo had a follower who has left a faint trace of his existence in a pen-drawing of no great merit, in the Uffizi. It represents the Annunciation which takes place in a hall of Transitional architecture with Gothic windows. The Virgin is far from youthful and unmistakably Filippesque. Gabriel suggests an uncouth pupil of Masolino and Fra Angelico. The pen-stroke, however, has a certain modest freedom.

#### IV

A far more important painter now claims our attention, one who, among Filippo's followers, was only less great than Botticelli, I mean Francesco Pesello. We possess, as I hope to prove, several of his drawings, one of them a composition of such importance as to be a precious addition to the too scanty list of his works. Indeed the drawing of which I am about to speak—it is in the Louvre—is so elaborately finished, and so highly coloured, that were it not for its technique, one would be tempted to rank it among paintings [Plate xxxvi].

In the foreground we see the Virgin and the shepherds kneeling in adoration, and Joseph between them asleep. The Holy Child, however, is not where the Madonna is directing her eyes, but in the wattled manger under the thatched shed. A peacock roosts to one side. Over the roof angels are dancing in a round, and in the middle distance a "bird of God" swoops down with the message to the shepherds. In the background a quiet silver lake lies ringed by low mountains. There is in this sketch a freshness and winsomeness not unworthy of Fra Filippo's finest moments. It almost would seem like a nosegay of all the sweetest flowers to be culled out of Filippo's garden, brought together by some one with a keener eye for refinement and daintiness than the master himself had, by some one moreover who gave them a higher charm by the grace of his arrangement.

That this person was Pesellino is by no means so obvious as to pass unquestioned, but I think it can be proved that he and no other was the author of this exquisite sketch. Perhaps the most striking divergences from Filippo's manner to be found here are in the animals, and in the draperies. In the painting of animals Filippo never advanced a step beyond his master, Lorenzo Monaco, and his oxen and asses are good Trecento beasts; whereas here their heads, at all events, have been studied from life, and rendered with considerable skill. But Pesellino, it will be remembered, enjoyed great renown as a painter precisely of animals, and to this his still existing pictures bear witness. Moreover, the ox and the ass here are of the exact breed that we find in Pesellino's Nativity [Florence Academy, 72]. As for the draperies, the folds of the Virgin's and of Joseph's robes in this sketch, have a quality—a paperiness, and yet a certain simplicity, a meeting at sharp angles—as foreign to Filippo at all times as it is characteristic of Pesellino in one of his phases: the phase, namely, in which we see him in the *predelle* of Prince Doria, in those of the Florence Academy [No. 72] and in other such works as, for instance, the miniature altar-piece in the Musée Condé at Chantilly,\* all of them painted perhaps for Filippo, and certainly soon after coming under his influence.† The draperies again of the dancing angels are not Filippo's, nor are their figures. The folds of their gowns tend to flow parallel, a characteristic which is always recurring in Pesellino. This group of angels, is, moreover, almost exactly matched, particularly in the folds, by the music-making angels in his Triumph of Religion (exhibited New Gallery 1894, Photographed by Dixon as

\* There attributed to Filippo, but as I have tried to demonstrate elsewhere, by Pesellino. See "Revue Internationale des Archives, des Bibliothèques et des Musées," Nos. 6-7, p. 135.

† I may be pardoned here a brief digression on Pesellino's development. After the Empoli Madonna with Saints and Angels [See my article in the "Revue Archéologique" for 1902], his earliest works are the Chantilly miniature altar-piece just mentioned, and another of a similar kind belonging to Captain Holford in London; and while they show that the young artist already was working with Filippo, they also prove that his heart was with some one else, with Domenico Veneziano, in short. In the *predelle* of the Florence Academy, and of Prince Doria the evolution to the dainty, slender, almost classic beauty of Pesellino's better known figures is completed. Throughout, the clarifying influence seems to me to have been Domenico's, whether in person, or by means of his works only. This influence, revealed chiefly in the draperies, and in certain types, Pesellino never lived to outgrow. Of course it was not so powerful, and certainly is not so obvious as Filippo's influence, but it must have been of the greatest value in his education as an artist.

P. di Cosimo, Nos. 129, 139), belonging to Mrs. J. L. Gardner of Boston, U.S.A. Other details must next be noticed. The Child is perfectly identical in figure, and in action with the Infant in Pesellino's Florence Academy Nativity already mentioned. The wattling of the manger is identical in both pictures, and much coarser than in the one instance in Filippo where it occurs, the Adoration in the collection of Sir Frederick Cook at Richmond. The shepherds adoring, particularly the foremost one, have the peculiarly prominent peaked noses which we find frequently in Pesellino's figures when approaching the profile.\* The hands also are long, slim, and boneless, such as never occur in Filippo's figures, but constantly in Pesellino.

I trust that those who have followed my argument will now share my conviction that the Louvre sketch for a Nativity is by Pesellino, and I hope that the importance of the theme will incline them to forgive the almost unavoidable tedium of such demonstrations. I must ask them to be patient with me yet awhile; and this time it is a drawing in the Uffizi of an elderly monk kneeling and a young woman walking away from him, to which we must turn our minds. The drawing in question [No. 121, Plate xxxvii] is in bistre and white on brown prepared paper, is not in perfect condition, and is attributed to Benozzo. Morelli saw clearer, but not clearly enough, in describing it as a copy after Fra Filippo (Kunstchronik, Nov. 24, 1892). Filippesque it is, of course, but as Pesellino was in his maturest years, when, having already parted company with Filippo, his style had settled into a harmony of all the finer influences he had been under. So in this drawing, while the monk is almost close enough to Filippo to be a copy after him, the woman scarcely suggests this master. Indeed the crumpled, or parallel folds of her dress, to one who was not well acquainted with Pesellino would call to mind the better known painter who affected a somewhat similar style of draperies, Benozzo, and hence, doubtless, the attribution.† The folds in both figures, with their tendency

\* Instances are too frequent to need mention. The very nearest in resemblance will be found among Prince Doria's *predelle*.

I cannot pass on without referring to another Nativity, also in the Louvre [No. 1343], and also associated with Fra Filippo, indeed ascribed to him. There is no lack of resemblances between these two Nativities, the animals, for instance, and the shepherds receiving the glad tidings. These groups of shepherds are, indeed, far too much alike to have arisen independently. The landscapes also have much in common. Now the attribution of the large Nativity to Fra Filippo is absurd, and based on the foolishly slender, and apparently untenable hypothesis that it is a picture of which Vasari speaks as being in S. Margherita at Prato (Cavalcaselle, v. 178 note). Cavalcaselle and Morelli both were inclined to see in this work the hand of either Baldovinetti or some one very close to him. That it is nearer in style to Baldovinetti than to Fra Filippo will scarcely be denied; but leaving aside the resemblance in arrangement with Alessio's fresco in the SS. Annunziata, in actual types and construction of the figures, and particularly in his draperies, the author of this Nativity seems to have been the pupil of Castagno. Now we already have noted the striking likeness of the group of shepherds here to the one in Pesellino's little Nativity, but the floating angels are even more Pesellinesque. In fact, but for the draperies, in which, as throughout the picture, we discern the influence of Castagno, these angels are exact copies of two angels, which I believe to be by a close imitator of Pesellino, one belonging to Lady Henry Somerset, and the other to the Countess Brownlow, fragments of an altar-piece now lost. It would seem probable therefore that the Louvre Nativity was a free rendering by some one who had been educated under Castagno, of an original by Pesellino. The same painter probably assisted Fra Diamante in completing the frescoes begun by Fra Filippo at Spoleto, and in the Nativity there, executed all but the figures of the Virgin, Joseph, and the shepherds.

† Benozzo's likeness to Pesellino is at times strong enough to confuse. Critics from Vasari to Morelli have ascribed to Pesellino the *predelle* of the former, at Casa Alessandri. Other respectable writers have chosen to turn the



to parallelism, to falling into loops, or to going zigzag are unmistakably Pesellino's. Add to this the spirit, which again is none but his.\* I can scarcely believe that the competent student who is well acquainted with such of Pesellino's works as the Doria *predelle*, Lady Wantage's Story of David, and Mrs. Gardner's Triumphs of Petrarch will fail to agree with me in this attribution.

I have spoken of the great influence that Domenico Veneziano must have exerted over Pesellino. In no extant painting by the latter is this influence so clearly manifested as in a drawing at the Uffizi [No. 1117], there ascribed to Raffaellino del Garbo. It really is the cartoon, pricked for transfer to the panel, for a small picture intended to represent the Marriage of St. Catherine. Excepting a very faint reminder in the Child, there is nothing here that recalls Filippino, but in the classical simplicity of the arrangement, in the ample sweep of the draperies, in the types, in the hair, in the hands, and in the way the Madonna is zoned, there is much which suggests the Domenico we know or can infer—for Domenico, unhappily, is as yet greatly more a subject of inference than of knowledge. To point to something obvious, we may note the likeness between the Virgin's hand with its curled-in fingers, and the bishop's hand in Veneziano's Uffizi altar-piece.

It is no great task to offer proofs that this cartoon is Pesellino's. Its very size to begin with speaks for him. The types of the women, types of unknown origin, are, excepting once or twice in Benozzo, found only in Pesellino or in his follower, "Compagno."† The form of the throne, the ear of the Child, the draperies are too Pesellinesque to need more than mention. The only remaining question is whether this cartoon is by Pesellino himself or his pupil "Compagno." For me, the question is settled in favour of the former by the suavity and grace of the composition, by the refinement of the sentiment, and the excellence of the draughtsmanship. These are qualities wherein the assistant never so closely approached the master as to endanger confusion between them.‡

In the collection of drawings which Dr. Gustavo Frizzoni inherited from Morelli, there is a pen-sketch of a young woman in the costume of about 1450 in which I clearly discern the spirit and hand of Francesco Pesellino [Plate xxxviii.]. To prove it is, however, no easy task, for there is little to take hold of in the way of readily tangible tests. To me it is the refinement of the charming creature, the gay vivacity of her movement, and the action, which chiefly suggest Pesellino. A process of exclusion leads me to the same artist; for granting what none will dispute, that the author of this sketch must have been a Florentine, who could

tables by attributing Captain Holford's little Pesellino to Gozzoli. The cause of this likeness must be sought for in some influence which they felt in common, the elder Pesello's I suspect.

\* The hands are most characteristic of Pesellino. With the form and action of the woman's, compare the female beside the bride in Lady Wantage's Marriage of David.

† Students acquainted with Captain Holford's Pesellino, or the various "Compagnos" reproduced by Mary Logan in the article of which I shall speak presently, will recognise the identity.

‡ I take great pleasure in the fact that a student so able as is Dr. Mackowsky, in distinguishing mere analogies and identities, is of my opinion regarding the attribution of this drawing. Since the above was written he has published it as Pesellino's. (*Zeitschrift für bildende Kunst*, 1899.)

he have been if not Pesellino? \* Comparison with his finished works but confirms the impression. In general feeling, this figure recalls the young women in Lady Wantage's and Mrs. Gardner's Triumphs, particularly the first female figure to the right in Mrs. Gardner's Triumph of Love. The action of the hands is subtly in the spirit of the master. Comparison should be made especially with the third figure (Cæsar?) on the left in Mrs. Gardner's Triumph of Fame. The costume in turn, with its long flowing, simple folds, should be compared with those of the women in the same Triumphs, especially in Lady Wantage's Marriage of David. As a pen-drawing, it would be hard to discover among those of Florence many readier, daintier, more lyrical—if I may say so—than this one. Here we have that rare occurrence in art, a perfect harmony between the spirit and technical methods of an artist. †

We have thus succeeded in adding several drawings to the few paintings of this exquisite artist, and drawings of a kind which but intensify one's lively admiration for his talents and style. Before leaving him entirely, I must speak of yet another study which has a certain connection with him. It is a sketch in sepia and white on a pinkish buff prepared ground, for a God the Father reading. It is in the collection of Herr von Beckerath, at Berlin, and is there ascribed to Botticelli [Plate xxxix.]. The very large, prominent eyes, and the general aspect of the figure at once suggest the God the Father in a well-known picture, the Trinity, in the National Gallery [No. 727], ascribed to Pesellino. Further study makes it clear that the drawing is by the same author, in a looser, more advanced phase. The treatment of the hair and beard is very much alike. The hand holding the book has the long lifeless fingers grasping the cross. The feet also, and much in the draperies, point to common authorship. Although in technique there is little here that does not recall Fra Filippo, yet in the spirit there is a suggestion of a painter who was veering towards the feebler naturalists, such as Cosimo Rosselli. The quality is distinctly above mediocrity.

Now if the National Gallery Trinity were by Pesellino, this sketch would be by him also. But, as I have said, it is looser, and more advanced, somewhat later therefore. Pesellino, however, as we know, died before the Trinity was finished, ‡ and I have little doubt this work was painted by an assistant, whose hand can be

\* Were we to judge by the costume alone, the author of this drawing would be identical with the one who painted the Rape of Helen in the National Gallery [No. 591]. Ascribed to Benozzo, this painted fairy tale is, as I have reason to believe, by one of his fellow pupils, one, moreover, of whom I already have spoken in my first chapter, Domenico di Michelino. But this Domenico, although he could be fascinating, could not but be feeble, and feeble Dr. Frizzoni's drawing is not. As for the really striking likeness, Domenico may have drawn inspiration from some work since lost by Pesellino, or by Benozzo in a Pesellinesque mood.

† After the above was written, I had the pleasure of finding strong confirmation of an attribution which, at first, was based on little more than mere feeling. The confirmation came in the shape of a *cassone* in the South Kensington Museum, on which *cassone* are painted Petrarch's Triumphs (reproduced in Prince d'Essling's "Petrarch," p. 147). The young woman representing Chastity differs but in trivial points from our drawing. As the *cassone* is obviously of the school of Pesellino, the identity just referred to connects the drawing closely with that master, and its quality vouches for its being from his own hand.

‡ Vasari, Sansoni, iii. p. 43. Cavalcaselle, Storia. iv. p. 6, n. 4.

traced in a number of other pictures. Who this craftsman was in the flesh I know not, but his artistic personality has recently been reconstructed by Mary Logan, and we shall do well to speak of him by the name of "Compagno di Pesellino" that she has given him.\* An examination of the Trinity goes far to prove that he, and not his master, was its author. While having, as is natural, much affinity with Pesellino, it betrays everywhere, as Morelli observed long ago (*Galerie Borghese & Doria*, p. 260), another and a coarser hand. The drawing is rougher, the structure and forms are not so refined, the cherubs are of quite a different breed, and finally the painting is brown, opaque, and not at all in Pesellino's light transparent tones. But if this panel is by Compagno, Herr von Beckerath's drawing must also be by him, in a somewhat more advanced phase, it is true, although not at all so late as another Trinity, a very degenerate work in the Florence Academy, which also I believe to be by him.†

The hand of another of Pesellino's assistants may be traced in a number of *cassone* panels of various subjects, chiefly from the Aeneid. Probably the best of them are in the Jarves Collection at New Haven, U.S.A. The same hand, if I mistake not, executed the illuminations in the famous Virgil codex, in the Riccardiana of Florence, and illustrated a manuscript of the Triumphs of Petrarch, in the same library. Several illustrations, the Triumph of Love in the Petrarch, and in the Virgil, among others, the Death of Anchises, remained wholly or partially uncoloured, and thus show the original pen-drawing. The artist has a daintiness of touch and a grace of line not unworthy of a follower of Pesellino.

More remotely connected with this subtle artist was one of humble attainments, a certain Giusto d'Andrea. It is known that, off and on, he worked with Neri di Bicci, with Filippo Lippi, and with Benozzo Gozzoli. It has not been sufficiently remarked, however, that he owed no little to contact with Pesellino's circle. Thus, in certain of his pictures, he comes near enough to "Compagno" to endanger confusion; and in the *predelle* of his principal work—it is true never before ascribed to him although manifestly his—a Madonna with Cosmas, Damian and two other saints, in the church of the Dominicans at S. Miniato al Tedesco—two of the sections are copied after wellknown panels by Pesellino himself.

If, as I have reason to believe, a highly decorative Annunciation at S. Martino à Mensola, near Florence, is by the same not unpleasant eclectic, then it makes more probable another conjecture of mine. This is that a drawing in the Malcolm Collection [No. 34] ascribed to R. del Garbo, may be by Giusto d'Andrea. The pen-sketch represents the curious spectacle of a rather youthful pope on horseback, with a chasuble over his shoulders, but a falcon on his

\* *Gazette des Beaux Arts*, July and October 1901.

† Compare the left hands with the right hand of the Madonna in Compagno's Louvre altar-piece [No. 1661] in M. Gustave Dreyfus' Madonna, Paris, or in Herr Bracht's Madonna, Berlin; the right hand with the right of the Faith, or of the male figure under the Charity in Compagno's two panels in the Wittgenstein Collection (Vienna), representing the Virtues and Liberal Arts. Our drawing must be of later date, however, than any of the paintings just mentioned.



wrist. Under him, in a hand, perhaps, somewhat later, it is written that this pope was no other than Clement V. (1305-1314). Behind him in a doorway, kneels an elderly woman with her hands crossed over her breast.

The attribution to Garbo need not detain us. The drawing clearly dates from before the birth of that painter. The woman's type is Filippesque, the horse is taken straight from Benozzo—it is but a reversal of the one mounted by the young king in the Riccardi frescoes—the pope suggests Pesellino. These various reminders and the likeness between the woman's hands and folds and kindred features in the S. Martino Annunciation make it just possible that Giusto d'Andrea was the author of this amusing sketch.

### V

At first thought, it seems strange that, excepting the Illustrations for Dante, which hold a place apart, so few drawings by Sandro Botticelli have come down to us; and considering the almost unparalleled number of pictures that issued from his shop, most of them probably from the start passing for his own, it is strange again that there exist no more drawings by his nameless assistants. The explanation may be found in this last fact. His horde of apprentices probably made very few drawings of their own, because they had at hand the far better sketches of the master, and these have become so rare because, as is likely, they were worn to tatters by repeated use.

Being so few in relation to the number of Sandro's paintings, his drawings may scarcely be expected to throw much new light on his quality as an artist—a quality so ready to reveal itself to the careful student of his finished works that, after all, no supplement is needed for its further elucidation. Such a great master of line as Botticelli needs not the help of the pencil to emphasise the revelation of his brush. The same touch of the whimsical, the same dreamy grace, the same subtlety of refinement that we learn to love in his pictures, meet us once more in his sundry sketches; and always the line which envelops, which models, which realises with such a vivacity, with such a speed in communicating itself that, if you do not frighten away its shy influence by too coldly assaying the anatomical correctness of its creations, you quickly find yourself not looking at the form but kissing it with your eyes, not discerning, but living the action.

After his Spring, and his Venus rising from the Sea, and on a level certainly with his Villa Lemmi frescoes, the most beautiful, and the most intimately specific of Sandro Botticelli's achievements, is a drawing with a fine pen in bistre heightened with white on a pinkish ground, in the Malcolm Collection [Plate xl.]. It is a representation of Abundance. A nymph, the Flora of the Spring, but grown older with the high ecstasy of the months spent between sowing and ingathering, older but none the less a mænad, with her hair streaming wildly to the wind, hastens

joyously through the land, followed by a train of roguish baby fauns. The soft meshes of her lambent draperies cling to her firm and slender figure, revealing her form as if it were nude, and conveying the action all the better for their fluttering back from the limbs, drawn in the opposite direction by the breeze. Her arm, it is true, is much longer than arms usually are, but here the composition required this length, and Sandro disdained not to make it reach down from her shoulder to the hand of the little faun who runs sportively beside her. You easily might find other faults in this sheet, if you chose, and could doubtless dwell upon them until the splendour of its beauty disappeared; but it is wiser to discount at a glance such failings as even a child may discover in many of the world's great masterpieces, and with no delay to devote ourselves, if it is in us, to wooing its indwelling soul of beauty.

Perhaps a moment's comparison of this masterpiece with the crude and stupid painting of the same subject, also ascribed to Sandro, in the Musée Condé at Chantilly, will not be out of place here. The author of the picture, who, by the way, would seem to have been that particular one among Botticelli's nameless followers who executed the Borghese *tondo* of a Madonna with the infant Baptist and six Angels, seems not to have followed the beautiful drawing. Apparently he made a jumble of this and of the woman carrying faggots with the child running before her, in the Sixtine fresco of Christ's Temptation. The Child in the Chantilly picture is but a misunderstood copy of the child in the fresco; the action of the woman is again more as in the fresco than in the drawing. Instead of dancing along with light step followed by the laughing *putti*, she hops forward balancing a load on her head, while with her hand she drags a caricatured *amorino* laming his legs and dislocating his arms, as she lifts him from the ground. It is a painful and ridiculous spectacle, but Botticelli's mistake has been avoided, and the arm given its normal length.

It remains to say a word about the colour effect of the Abundance. Here, as always in Botticelli, when at his best, the colour lends a finer significance to the form, gives it an added glamour as of objects in themselves beautiful seen under the transmuting touch of the sunrise or sunset light. Then there is a bloom upon this page as of the down upon the peach—an evanescent bloom which harmonises well with the impression here conveyed of things passing, and soon to disappear—but not out of memory.

Somewhat the same colour impression, due to the pinkish ground, the outlines in bistre, the heightening with white, is made by Sandro's few other important drawings; only, as they never approach the Abundance in its dreamy grace, they never suggest its mellow softness. The sheet which ranks next in excellence is in the Uffizi, and is a study for the Baptist [Plate xli.]. The rugged figure is one of Sandro's manliest, and of near kin to the intellectually and physically robust and eager St. Augustine in the Ognissanti fresco. The heads of both are modelled with equal firmness. The hair in each has the same plastic quality; the draperies hang as

simply, and have, allowing for the difference in material, the same beauty of line. In date also I should not place them far apart; and just as the Abundance must have been created at a time nearer to the Spring than to the Birth of Venus, the St. John must have been drawn in the interval between the execution of the St. Augustine, and of the altar-piece [now in the Florence Academy, No. 85] representing The Madonna, Angels, and Saints but nearer to the fresco. In the altar-piece there is also a Baptist, but although the outstretched arm is almost identical in both figures, they have little in common, the sketched figure being as perfect as the other is unfortunate.

Scarcely less masterly is another drawing in the Uffizi, for a St. Jerome clad in his cardinal's robes, seated, and for a moment holding up his pen from his book [Plate xlii.]. The figure is severe, and severely fashioned. The cheek-bone is rounded off with the firmness of the so-called Medallist [Uffizi, No. 1154]. Admirable also is the arrangement of the drapery: not a wanton touch anywhere, the line either functional or adding to the action, but never listless, and never idle.

A study in the same collection for a Nativity [Plate xliii.] dates from Sandro's last years, and even when we have made ample allowance for the damage and the still more harmful restoration that it has suffered, it yet bears sad witness to the slovenliness into which the artist fell at the last. There is just enough of the lion's life left here to convince me that it is he and no ass masquerading in his skin. The Madonna, for instance, really is kneeling, as she kneels in the National Gallery Nativity, as the St. Jerome kneels in the little picture representing his communion (Florence, Marchese G. Farinola), not as, for instance, in Mr. Fuller Maitland's Nativity—a school-picture in which some pupil is seen to copy some such drawing as the one before us, without understanding that, in the master's work, the draperies were intended to convey the corporeal existence and the action, not to get rid of them.

No painting corresponding exactly to this drawing is known to me,\* and even if it ever existed its loss is not one to make us disconsolate; but if yet another study in the Uffizi, this time of three angels in a lunette, was ever executed, then we have suffered a loss such as that of the Coronation would have been. Two of the angels float facing each other, and the third with his hand resting on both their shoulders, wafts them forward while they all sing a chorale out of a book [Plate xlv.]. Even in Botticelli it would be hard to find a more exquisite idea more daintily carried out. The way the space is filled, the gentle floating of the figures, the slim, graceful nudes felt through the lightly fluttering draperies, the wafting towards us, the lovely line of the loveliest face—I can scarcely conceive a harmony more delicate in its perfection. Among existing works there is a distant approach to this *motif* in the three angels singing in Sandro's National Gallery Nativity, and a much nearer one in the three angels floating and singing in the Coronation painted by some poor follower, once upon a time in S. Giusto at Volterra.†

\* The pictures nearest are, beside Botticelli's own Nativity in the National Gallery, the Nativities belonging to Mr. Fuller Maitland, to Mrs. Austen, and to Mr. Wickham Flower.

† Now (May 1898) belonging to Mr. Larkin Mead of Florence.



One other drawing (in the Ambrosiana) merits our special attention, before we turn to the illustrations for Dante. Like these it is in pen and ink, and is a study for a Pallas. She stands on a pedestal, in her right hand a mace, her left on her shield, upon which is embossed the head of Medusa. The figure is daintily and easily done with a lightness of touch rivalling Filippo's in the sketch appended to his letter, and as fine at least as the best pages of the Dante illustrations. Executed at some time soon after 1490, I do not readily see what purpose it could have served. Perhaps it was for some festive decoration. Certainly it has no connection with the Pallas and Centaur recently re-discovered in the Pitti Palace.

Botticelli's illustrations for Dante's "*Divina Commedia*" hold a peculiar place in art, if, for no other reason, because they are the only thing of the kind in existence due to a great Italian master.\* To treat them as they merit would take a volume. Here we can devote but a few paragraphs to a general estimate of their quality both as illustration and as art.

As illustrations, these drawings will to most people prove disappointing. They have heard that Botticelli was a great artist, and they expect him to give them to a heightened degree feelings of the kind and quality that they have had in reading Dante. None of the gloom, the chill dread, the passion, the despair, the luridness of the "*Inferno*" will be brought home to them, as they turn over Sandro's designs. They will find scarcely an attempt at dramatic expression; they will discover many more instances of the unconscious grotesque than of the realised sublime; and, throughout, conceptions as infantile as Fra Angelico's, but seldom so winning. Nor, regarded as real illustration, are matters much mended in the "*Purgatorio*." There is no trace in Botticelli of the feeling of hope and convalescence and of early morning dew which penetrates you as you read these cantos of Dante. And Sandro's "*Paradiso*" fails no less in communicating the one quality essential to this part of the poem—its sublimity. Here, again, the artist remains shut up in the Fra Angelico world. All in all, Rossetti's "*Blessed Damozel*" would have been a subject more suitable to Botticelli's fancy than Dante's "*Divina Commedia*."

As illustrator, then, to the "*Divina Commedia*," Botticelli, it must be acknowledged, disappoints, partly because his genius was not at all Dantesque, but chiefly because the poem does not lend itself to satisfactory illustration. Dante, it is true, describes with a vividness and a tangibility seldom attained by other poets, but his effects rarely result from an appeal to vision only. Yet visual form, so small a part of the poet's outfit, is the illustrator's entire tool-chest. All his effects must come through it, and may not come otherwise. Think of making mere outline, as in the case of Botticelli's designs, convey all the varied sensations, all the passions and emotions, which rapidly succeed one another in Dante's verses! One might

\* All the learning which is of value on this part of my subject will be found in the monographs by Lippmann and Strzygowski accompanying the publication in facsimile of these illustrations, and in Mr. Herbert P. Horne's book on Botticelli. In my opinions these drawings probably do not antedate 1490.

as well attempt to render Beethoven's "Ninth Symphony" or Berlioz's "Dies Irae" with no other instrument than the harp.

And even if it were possible to make outline convey feelings as full and penetrating as Dante's, which episodes should the illustrator choose? They follow each other in bewildering number, having in the realm of things that can be visually represented no connection between one another, held together by nothing more tangible than the emotional tone of each canto. The truth is that Dante is not a great epic or dramatic poet. He has none of those stretches of culminating narrative, none of the working-up a tale to a climax, which lend themselves so admirably to the exercise of the visual imagination. In spite of the fact that he wrote one of the longest poems in European literature, and that this poem is apparently a narrative, Dante as a poet is great only as a master of the lyric, or (to make a concession) of the "dramatic lyric." But the lyric is beyond the reach of the illustrator.

Thus Dante does not lend himself to illustration; and, even if he did, Botticelli was not the man for the task. Then, it may well be asked, what is the value of his illustrations? The answer is simple enough. Their value consists in their being drawings by Botticelli, not at all in their being illustrations to Dante. And at this point we shall do well to remember that a drawing by Botticelli is something very peculiar. It does not so much as attempt to be correct. A hundred "artist-journalists" now at work, publish every day drawings which are far more exact, closer in resemblance, more clever, and more brilliant than any you will find in Botticelli's designs for the "Divina Commedia." If theirs is the only kind of drawing which you relish, you will be no less disappointed in Sandro than if you came to him for interpretive illustration. His real place among draughtsmen is scarcely with the great Europeans, but with the great Chinese and Japanese, with Ririomin, Haronobu and Hokusai. Like these, he is a supreme master of the single line. He gives it a swiftness and a purity which, in the whole world of sensation, find their analogy only in some few ecstatic notes of the violin, or in the most crystal-line *timbre* of the soprano voice. His universe was of the simplest. It consisted of things that could and of things that could not furnish themes for rhapsodies in swift, pure line. Dante happened to find himself among the blessed in this simple division; hence Botticelli found in him a subject fit for his art. These illustrations, excepting in a few sheets, happily have no colouring, and make scarcely an attempt at stereotyped composition. Here he is free as nowhere else, and here, therefore, we see him in his most unadulterated form. The value then of these illustrations consists in their being the most spontaneous product of the greatest master of single line which our modern Western world has yet possessed.

Now let us look at a few of these designs, beginning with the "Inferno," where Botticelli, feeling weighed down by the story, is least himself. What do we see as we glance at the drawing for the opening canto? In the first place, a fret-work arrangement of exquisite pen-strokes, by itself as pleasant as moonlight on

rippling water. Seen closer, this smiling fretwork becomes a wood of graceful stems, whose branches cross and cross again, like the rapiers of courteous fencers. In rhythmic balance to the mass of this dainty forest grows a tangle of flower-bushes. Between, ramp three heraldic beasts, performing a figure with four men whose long mantles fall into lines as swift and almost as pure as those of the tree stems. I defy any one to read gloom and terror into this piece of lineal decoration. Or turn to the design for "Inferno XIII." Again a marvellous fretwork of lines which, seen closer, resolve themselves into a tangled wood where decorative dogs leap at decorative nudes, while even more decorative harpies sit upon the branches. We are in the pound of the suicides, but as here represented, it could cause a shiver in none but a child with a feverish imagination. In other sheets, it cannot be denied—indeed in many of those for the "Inferno"—there is somewhat more correspondence with the text, but I doubt whether it ever is enough to be satisfactory as expression, while it is precisely in such drawings that Sandro is least delightful as pure art. At times, however, there occurs a fortunate accord between the way Botticelli would naturally treat a subject, and Dante's feeling about it. This happens rarely in the "Inferno," where it would be hard to instance another example than that of the hypocrites under their copes of lead (singularly Japanese, by the way, in movement of line); but, beyond the "Inferno," as we shall see, this accord grows more and more frequent.

Botticelli's strength, however, was not in arrangement alone. He was above everything master of the line in movement. He loved to make the line run and leap, to make it whirl and dance. He was truly great when he had a theme which permitted the exercise of this mastery. Such themes the "Purgatorio" and "Paradiso" offered him in plenty. To cite all the examples would lengthen my paragraph into a long chapter, wherefore I must limit myself to a few of the best. You will rarely see a frieze of greater decorative beauty than is formed by the nudes leaping into the Purgatorial flames, as if these were the waters of the Fountain of Youth, while Virgil and Statius and Dante pass by, discoursing on the relation between soul and body. This is the illustration to "Purgatorio XXV.," and, thereafter, every consecutive drawing becomes, if possible, more and more beautiful. The flames leap even higher, and the nudes are worked in with them even more harmoniously. And presently you come to a design whose beauty keeps you spellbound: rare trees shoot up with exquisite grace, and between them you behold the poets breathing gladly and gazing at the pure ether. One lady, with fascinating movement of figure and flutter of drapery, is gathering flowers, and another addresses the poets. Are we in Dante's terrestrial Paradise, or in Poliziano's "Realm of Venus"? No matter which, it could not be more lovely. This page is followed by a succession of scenes in which Botticelli's talents find their completest realisation: the car of the Church, the majestic elders, the dancing flower-scattering angels, the torch-bearers, the streaming smoke, the heraldic beasts—each and all so many exquisitely drawn, laughing, leaping, whirling lines in wonderful arrangement.



But the crown of the entire work is still to come. The daintiest trees ever drawn wave softly over a smooth meadow, wet with the waters of Eunoe's placid stream. Behind the rare leafage on the reed-like stems, Beatrice and Dante, with faces of ecstasy, are wafted up gently to the higher spheres. To convey in words the impression left upon me by the singular beauty of this design would require Dante himself, in his finest, tenderest moments, or perhaps Shakespeare or Keats. Line, movement, and pattern can no further go. None of the remaining illustrations can be placed beside this one; yet they all are lovely. The type of them is the sheet for "Paradiso VI."—a pure circle studded with exquisite flamelets, Beatrice pointing upward as she floats, and Dante with his face and hands expressive of the utmost bliss. The dancing of the flames, the flutter of the draperies, the bending towards each other of the two figures, with the whole enclosed in a pure circle, form one of those happy patterns which, for the very reason of their childlike simplicity, one can gaze at for hours, ever soothed and refreshed.

## VI

It was thus that Botticelli increased and refined for its own sake the heritage of line, which through Filippo Lippi and Lorenzo Monaco had been transmitted to him from the Trecento. To carry it further would perhaps have been impossible; at all events, as I already have said, among his successors there was no one who could reach up to his own height. Of Filippo Lippi, and Raffaellino del Garbo I shall speak in the next chapter. Here it remains for me to devote a moment's attention to Sandro's, so to say, more domestic followers, as draughtsmen. Their drawings, I repeat, are few, and those which deserve special notice here are even fewer—perhaps three or four only. One of these is a study in the Malcolm Collection for a Fides, and another, in the Uffizi, is for a Pallas, and a third, an entire composition at Darmstadt. All three are in pen and bistre with a very slight heightening of white, and they certainly are by the same hand. This fact is evinced by their having the same forms, the same technique, and the same spirit. That they are not by Botticelli himself, despite their having passed hitherto without question as his, is proved, I think, by their great inferiority in the conveying of corporeal reality, by the relative aimlessness of the folds, by the faults in draughtsmanship, which either are not Sandro's at all, or are exaggerations of Sandro's, by the lack of life in the line, and finally by the niggling hatching in the shadows.

The finest of the three is the Fides (Plate xlv.), which has about it a gleam of that sentiment, prophetic of Burne-Jones, which makes the work of many of Sandro's pupils so much more acceptable nowadays than his own. The Pallas has its own interest, not æsthetic—far from it—but archæological. It is squared out for enlarging, and is quite certainly the first sketch for the cartoon which served for a tapestry now

belonging to the Comte de Baudreuil.\* In the drawing the head is as yet unsettled, otherwise, so far as it goes, it is identical with the tapestry. The design may well have been ordered of Sandro himself, but here we have proof that he did not as much as take the trouble to make for it a first sketch.†

The most elaborate of the three, the one at Darmstadt, is a design consisting of eight figures, representing in the traditional way the unbelievers standing out of doors in various attitudes of excitement, amazement, or sudden conviction, below the upper chamber wherein the Holy Spirit was descending upon the faithful. The exaggerations of action and expression recall that crude work of Sandro's school, Sir Frederick Cook's Descent of the Holy Spirit. Excepting, however, the subject and the obvious likenesses prevailing among fellow pupils, our drawing, which betrays a much abler and subtler hand, has little in common with that composition. Nor am I at all persuaded that our sketch was necessarily for a painting. It rather would seem to have served for an embroidery.

To some one just outside Botticelli's domestic circle, to some nameless but rather fascinating person who strongly felt Filippino's influence as well, I would ascribe the charming drawing in the Uffizi [No. 1248] of two olive-wreathed youths kneeling in the midst of four brethren of the Misericordia, while the Holy Spirit descends upon them. The idea is as quaint and original as the touch is alert and alive. This sketch is attributed to Pier di Cosimo, but although it is so much in his spirit, it certainly is not by him. The two kneeling figures are near to Botticelli not only in type, and in the form of the hands, but even in the action, and all in all come singularly close to the lunette with the three singing angels [Uffizi, No. 187] of which I have spoken. The other figures are more Filippinesque in manner. It is by no means impossible that we have to do here with an early and peculiarly happy product of Raffaellino del Garbo's pen. This, however, is a mere conjecture, and for the present, at all events, such a drawing is more safely described as of Botticelli's school (Plate xlvi.).

## VII

Although it is my purpose to treat of the drawings of painters only, yet for once I shall turn aside to speak of a few sketches by a great architect who was a poor sculptor, and in every probability, not at all a painter, although apparently a devoted admirer of Botticelli and his school—Giuliano da S. Gallo. This is proved not only by the famous *tondo* of Sandro's school (in the National Gallery) which on its back bears Giuliano's name, but far more by the pathetically crude and uncouth imitation of the great master which appears in many of his figure-drawings.

\* Reproduced in colour as frontispiece to M. Müntz's "Les Primitifs."

† I cannot here take space to discuss the relation of this Pallas to others which Sandro may or may not have painted or designed. Much in this highly unimportant problem depends on this drawing, and if it, as I believe, is not Sandro's, the whole question is lightened both of difficulty and—interest.

In the public library of Siena there is a sketch-book\* by Giuliano on the last page of which is written the date, May 23, 1500—the date that is of his putting the last stone to the cupola of the basilica covering the Holy House at Loreto. The whole of page 32 is taken up with a pen-sketch of a Judith. She has just cut off the head of Holofernes and holds it aloft while her servant comes up with a basket to receive it. This Judith is no copy of Botticelli's, yet betrays Sandro's spiritual influence in a thousand ways. I say "spiritual influence" because there is nothing in its niggling, timid technique, with its petty hatching and dimpling, to remind one of Sandro's sweep of line (Plate xlvii.).

In the Albertina at Vienna there is a larger version of the Judith, in other materials—in black chalk, ink and brownish wash. The differences in types and accessories are slight, the greatest being the substitution of a bowl for the basket. Technically the divergence is somewhat greater. The less elaborated figure of the servant, for instance, is more Botticellesque in outline than in any part of the Sienese sketch. But to ascribe it to Botticelli, as is now done at Vienna, is to leap before looking. In the first place there is nothing here that evinces so much as a close following of Sandro, not to speak of his own intimate quality. Then the Vienna Judith has all Giuliano's tricks, both of vision and of hand. The features are mean and slurred over, as in all his other drawings. The folds tend to fall into furrows or flutings. The shading is done with petty hatching from right to left.

If the comparison with the Siena drawing alone will not convince one that Giuliano was the author of the Albertina Judith also,† one should look at two other drawings both perfectly authenticated as S. Gallo's. One of them is a sketch with the stilus, gone over in ink for a *tondo*, and is a page of the Barberini sketch-book,‡ which was begun, as Giuliano informs us on the title-page, in 1465, but remained in use till 1488 and later. In the *tondo* we see the Madonna, a very tall figure, stooping slightly to the Child who is held up to her by two angels. Other angels are grouped about her, worshipping and making music. The relation to Botticelli remains the same, something in the composition, in the types, and in the spirit, so close to him, as to suggest the possibility of its being a copy after him. But technically, this sketch has all the pettiness, and all the crudities, that we found in the two Judiths, even to the drawing of the feet with the swelling on the first joint of the big toe.

The other sketch of which I was to speak is, in many respects, nearest of all to Botticelli, far closer than the Albertina Judith. The drawing in question is found on one of the sheets of architecture at the Uffizi, and is neither more nor less than a copy in pen and wash of the first figure on the left in the fresco from

\*The whole of this has been reproduced in facsimile by Rodolfo Falb under the title of "Il Taccuino Senese di Giuliano da San Gallo," Siena 1902.

† Years after writing the above, Bartsch's "Catalogue Raisonné" of Prince Charles de Ligne's collection of drawings, published in 1794, fell into my hands. There our design is catalogued on p. 38 as Giuliano da San Gallo's. As old Bartsch surely did not invent this attribution himself, he must have recorded a tradition.

‡ I owe my acquaintance with this drawing to the great kindness of Herr von Fabriczy.



the Villa Lemmi [now in the Louvre, No. 73] representing Giovanni Tornabuoni and the Graces. Under the inspiration of such an original Giuliano did his best, but it is little enough. If we compare it with the Vienna Judith we shall find the same manner of hatching, the same way of doing the hair, and folds that are kindred. And the Uffizi drawing shows us where he gets his curious, fluted folds. They are an exaggeration of the draperies which Botticelli used this one time, and scarcely ever again, and illustrate the fact that the poorer the imitator, the more likely is he to base his entire manner on the exaggeration of some small, relatively insignificant feature of his master's art (Plate xlviii.).

Other figure-drawings by Giuliano exist, and such as are known to me and are of sufficient interest will be found enumerated in the catalogue at the end of this volume. Here we can give him no more space. The little we have devoted to him is far more than he deserves as a draughtsman; but I trust it will serve a double purpose. In the first place it will remove, once for all I hope, the possibility of ascribing scrawls such as his to the great Sandro. Then, critics acquainted with Giuliano's drawings will perhaps not be tempted to attribute to him such products of Botticelli's serious following, as the *tondo* of the National Gallery [No. 275].

## VIII

Pesellino and Botticelli were by no means the only followers of Fra Filippo, although the only ones of the first rank as artists. We already have noted one of the smaller, indeed, of almost contemptible attainments, I mean Fra Diamante, and two others still demand attention. Of this couple the probable elder was Jacopo del Sellajo, but as he was greatly inferior to the other pupil, Amico di Sandro, and even dependent upon him, I shall leave him to the last. Neither of them need detain us very long, for, happily, their careers as painters have been treated elsewhere. Sellajo has been sketched out by Dr. Mackowsky in vol. xx. of the "Jahrbücher der Preussischen Kunstsammlungen," and by Mary Logan in the "Revue Archéologique" (1899, p. 478; 1900, p. 300). Of Amico I made a reconstruction, with the purpose of inserting it in this book, but it grew to such considerable length, that finally it seemed better to let it stand apart. It appeared therefore first in the "Gazette des Beaux Arts" (June, July 1899), and later, in the first series of my "Study and Criticism of Italian Art."\* In making this statement, my intention is not to furnish a fragment of autobiography, but to explain that what follows here regarding Amico's drawings, having originally formed part of that essay, assumes the reader's acquaintance with what went before.

\* London, G. Bell and Sons, 1901.

Among the earliest of Amico's drawings are the two Verrocchiesque heads in the Uffizi ascribed to Botticelli [Nos. 1153, 1156]. Both are in the same materials—silver-point heightened with white on pinkish prepared paper—of the same quality, and of almost the same size, and therefore may well be treated together. One is the bust, almost in profile, of a woman wearing a hood—a study perhaps for the Madonna in a Nativity. The other is seen almost full face. Both have that Verrocchio-Botticellian type which we learned to know in Amico's early Madonnas. The noses and mouths are somewhat out of drawing, as in those pictures. The mouth of the figure seen full face is almost identical with Esmeralda Bandinelli's. The hair is treated largely and roughly. The edge of the hood is outlined in the same petty way that we found in the Naples Madonna, and elsewhere in Amico's paintings. A prepared mind, patiently studying these two heads, in connection with all the early works by Amico that I have enumerated, can scarcely fail to discern that they are all by the same hand.

Although of somewhat later date than either of these heads, the affinity between the one of the Madonna and a certain drawing in the His de la Salle Collection of the Louvre, is so close as to justify speaking of it here. The Louvre sketch, also of a Madonna—catalogued as Portrait of a Woman by Botticelli—is better and finer, but betrays the same mannerisms, if in a somewhat advanced stage. The brow and lids, for instance, are nearly identical; so is the line of the hood; while the folds are more as in the Esther panels. By Botticelli, this sketch so obviously is not, that M. de Tauzia observed as long ago as 1881 "that it affords striking analogies to the works of Filippino's youth." M. de Tauzia doubtless had in mind pictures by Amico attributed to the younger Lippi (Plate xlix.).\*

The same collection, His de la Salle, contains Amico's perhaps finest, certainly most interesting drawing. It is attributed to Pollajuolo, but is, nevertheless, a sketch for the Turin Archangels. The drawing, as we now see it, is obviously torn on the left edge; it probably extended further in that direction, and originally contained the figure of Michael, now wanting. At present we have but Raphael and Gabriel. Although the identity between the sketch and the painting is not absolute, a glance at the reproductions† of the two will convince any competent person that the one is a study for the other. The drawing then is indisputably by Amico, and we shall therefore linger over it a moment, to study him as a draughtsman. As in his paintings, but somewhat more conspicuously, we find him prompt, vivacious, charming, but careless and in haste. His pen-stroke has a pretty ripple, and yet is firm. The shading, however, is tame, in parallel lines, such as we already have seen in his other drawings; but he uses white with great pictorial effect. As might be expected—for a painter works more freely in a

\* The credit of first noting Amico's hand in this drawing is due to Mr. Herbert Horne.

† See my "Study and Criticism of Italian Art," First Series, p. 50.

sketch, and therefore often advances on the style of his finished work—certain traits in this drawing point to a somewhat later phase than that of the Archangels. The folds in Gabriel's dress, for instance, are already as in the Esther panels (Plate I.).

We found Amico in his various *cassone* pictures anticipating Botticelli's later manner. The same phenomenon appears in his drawings as well, but even more strikingly. In the Uffizi there is a sketch for a Saint resurrecting a Youth; at Berlin, in Herr von Beckerath's Collection, there is another sketch wherein we see a woman kneeling in passionate supplication before the men, perhaps the Apostles, who turn to listen. Very likely the two drawings are for episodes of the same legend; they are of the same style, nearer to Sandro than Amico usually is; and certainly they are by the same hand. That the hand is not Botticelli's, to whom they both are attributed, but Amico's, is proved by the types—the deep-set eyes, and the mouths in particular—by the treatment of the hair, and by the loose yet pleasant touch.

Later still, from Amico's last years, from the time when he painted pictures that usually pass under Filippino's name, is the charming drawing, nevertheless ascribed to Sandro, of an Epiphany in the Uffizi. In refinement and grace, it is worthy of the author of the National Gallery Adoration, and in no other work are Amico's characteristics so defined. The tall heads, the *retroussés* noses, the deep-set eyes, and the spirited expression—then as treatment, the shading, the drawing of the hair, the careful indication of the stones whereof the shed is built, the landscape of vague outlines, with the tree dark and spotty against the sky—all are distinct features of Amico's art. Note that the horse's head is identical with the one in the panel of Haman parading Mordecai (Plate li.).

Three heads, passing, the first two as Filippino's, and the other as Lorenzo di Credi's, also are from Amico's latest years. The finest of them (in Herr von Beckerath's Collection) is of a youth almost in profile, with soft, streaming hair—a delicious effect in red chalk, rivalling in its ease and grace the best bits in the Esther pictures. Here also everything betrays Amico's hand, treatment no less than type. Note particularly, the eyes, the hair, and the use of white (Plate lii.). Slighter and somewhat less delightful is a similar head in the Louvre. In the former Mitchell Collection there used to be the bust of yet another youth wearing a cap, certainly a portrait, having in expression, in features, and in treatment, all the sign-marks of Amico.

Finally the pen-drawing of a Coronation in the Uffizi may well have been one of the very last that Amico ever executed. It is ascribed to Botticelli and no doubt has such affinities with this great master as everything else of Amico's has. But the quality and the touch prove that it is not Sandro's own. The types, the treatment—the hatching—the draperies, summary or niggling, prove with equal decision that this sketch is Amico's. The painting with which it has closest connection is the well-known Coronation, formerly in S. Jacopo di Ripoli at



Florence, now in the convent of La Quiete outside Porta Faenza. This altar-piece has recently been deprived of its attribution to Botticelli, and been transferred to his school. But of his school in a narrower sense it is not at all. The chief elements in the picture, such as most of the types, the arrangement, and the colour, were derived from Amico. There are other influences visible, Cosimo Rosselli's, for instance. I thus cannot resist the conclusion that this altar-piece, ordered probably of Amico, for which therefore he would have made the drawing in the Uffizi just noted, was executed directly after his death, by some assistant who also had worked with Verrocchio and Cosimo Rosselli. As the lower part contains less of Amico, it is probable that here the assistant had, to some extent, to draw on his own invention, or rather on his own memory.

## IX

Jacopo del Sellajo was one of those feeble personalities, common to Florentine art, who could resist no wind of doctrine. They were ever ready to take up with the fashions of worthier men, to which they were aided through being, when work was pressing, requisitioned as assistants by these nobler artists. Thus it is that Sellajo, besides working for Domenico Ghirlandajo, as in the two pictures, a Pietà, and an Adoration of the Magi, painted for Badia à Settimo, and now in the Cenacolo di S. Apollonia, may have assisted Botticelli and Amico di Sandro as well. Indeed, if, as I believe, the *cassone* picture of the Pucci series, representing a feast, formerly in the Leyland Collection, and now in that of Mr. Vernon Watney, was executed by Sellajo, this could have taken place in Botticelli's workshop only, under his immediate supervision, and upon his designs. Such a close connection would account for pictures of so Botticellian a character as Sellajo's Venus in the Louvre, and the other in the National Gallery, and as the Madonna of the Rose Hedge, also in two examples, both in Paris, one in the collection of M. Gustave Dreyfus and the other in that of M. Léon Bonnat, in both of which besides Botticelli's Amico's influence is manifest. This appears in the landscape backgrounds of Prince Trivulzio's Young Baptist, and of such *cassoni* as the two with the Death of Cæsar at Berlin, and becomes mere imitation, or even copying, in a Madonna with Angels which was recently left by the Baronne Nathaniel de Rothschild to the Louvre, and in a series of panels recounting the Story of Esther, one of which has just entered the Louvre, while the others have long been in the Uffizi. Nor have I yet recounted all Sellajo's debts, as, for instance, to Cosimo Rosselli (Madonna in New Haven), to Botticini (Berlin Pietà), and less directly to Castagno and Verrocchio.

Something of all these various influences will appear in the three drawings, which I believe we may venture to ascribe to Sellajo.

The earliest is a sheet in the Malcolm Collection [No. 17] ascribed to Domenico

Ghirlandajo. It contains two studies, one for a Madonna sitting stiffly if not haughtily, and the other for a Virgin adoring the Child, who lies curled up on the edge of her skirt. Despite the attribution, Sellajo here is not at all Ghirlandajesque, but Filippesque and Castagnesque. The latter tincture is felt in the more expressive and deliberate parts, the two Madonnas' heads—from which we may infer that this influence was then recent and conscious—the Filippesque in the draperies, and in the infants. For the attribution to Sellajo I adduce the following only among many reasons that might be given. This precise arrangement of the Madonna Adoring was a theme so pleasant to Jacopo that I know, among his extant works, at least a dozen repetitions thereof. Our sketch, however, comes closest to one in the Jarves Collection at New Haven, U.S.A., in which work the folds are treated in the same slovenly, summary, Filippesque fashion. Another panel in the same collection, a seated Madonna, is like enough to the other study on our sheet to make it possible that the sketch was a study for the painting. At all events, the folds over the waist and between the knees are identical. It will be noted, furthermore, that one of the two children in this drawing has a head too large, and the other too small. The children's heads in Sellajo's pictures are almost invariably thus, over or under the mean. Finally, the kneeling Virgin's hands are characteristic of our minor master's earlier manner.

In the second drawing, which is in the British Museum, we have a design of remarkable poetical spirit, for a Nativity. In the foreground of a forest-clearing, four child angels hold up the Infant Christ, for the worship of His kneeling Mother. Cherubs flashing forth beams stronger than the sun's rays appear, single or in groups, in the heavens and on the ground at the feet of the Child. Under the solemn trees the boy Baptist is seen coming forward [Plate liii.].

This sheet is also ascribed to Ghirlandajo, and with somewhat better reason. The Madonna's head and hands certainly recall that exemplary mediocrity, and so do the round hills in the background. Nothing else in this composition, however, suggests Domenico, and the quality of the draughtsmanship is as inferior to his as the poetry of the design was beyond him. Here there is the penetrating freshness and hush of the forest; here there is a feeling of worship; here there is an attempt at symbolism, which I have never met with in Ghirlandajo, while they scarcely surprise us in the pupil of Fra Filippo, assistant of Botticelli and Amico di Sandro, and author of such genuinely poetical paintings as the S. Ansano Triumph of Chastity and the Berlin Meeting of the boy Christ and Baptist. In the latter picture the meeting takes place amidst the peace of the forest, where the does rest undisturbed by pleasant pools. Nor is direct proof wanting that Sellajo was the author of this noble design. Most obviously his is the landscape with its slender cypresses and trimmed pines. The child angels are his. Compare them, for instance, with the cupids in both the Venuses, or with the numerous angels in the S. Ansano Triumph of Religion, or, best of all, with the cherub on the right in the seated Jarves Madonna. That head is identical

with the angel's nearest the kneeling Virgin. The draperies are summary and careless despite the fine Verrocchiesque arrangement of the Madonna's mantle. Nor is it difficult to explain the Ghirlandajesque element here, for we know that Sellajo assisted and imitated Domenico. Note how Ghirlandajesque is the left hand of the Magdalen in the S. Frediano Crucifixion, Sellajo's most authenticated work, and further, how like that head is to the Madonna's in our drawing.

I feel somewhat less confident in ascribing to Sellajo a study at Lille, for the Evangelist Matthew. He sits in profile to right with his head leaning on his left hand, the elbow of which rests on a book kept open on his lap with his right hand. To the right, spiritedly sketched in outline, is the fore part of the symbolical bull. The whole is enclosed under a curve, which suggests that this design of delicate feeling and fine arrangement was intended for a lunette. It is ascribed to Fra Filippo, and not altogether absurdly, for this figure is a free rendering, such as one would make from memory, of that master's St. Luke in the ceiling of the choir at Prato. Yet that it is not his own drawing there is much to assure us. Thus, the head has something indefinably Ghirlandajesque, and the sentiment is later than Filippo's. This combination of elements points to Jacopo del Sellajo. Before settling on this name I had thought of Amico di Sandro, and Alunno di Domenico. But the former never so definitely suggests Ghirlandajo, while the latter never recalls Filippo. By the exclusion, therefore, of other known candidates, we arrive at Jacopo. And his it well may be, although there is more spirit in this sketch than I should have expected of his draughtsmanship.



## CHAPTER V

### FILIPPINO LIPPI AND RAFFAELLINO DEL GARBO

THE history of Filippino Lippi's career as a painter offers relatively few problems. Of these many have been satisfactorily settled long ago, although there still are people, like the recent succession of National Gallery directors, who, far from knowing that these problems have been settled, seem not so much as to have heard that they ever had been raised.\* Other questions have been, I trust, adequately discussed in the course of my study on Amico di Sandro. There I segregated the pictures by Amico, usually ascribed to Filippino, thus giving a firmer outline to the latter's artistic personality. Furthermore, by demonstrating his close dependence in his youth upon Amico, we have found an excellent means for studying the chronology of his works. We concluded that among his very earliest must be placed the Carmine frescoes, the Corsini tondo, and the Naples Annunciation. It remains for me to add to this list of pictures antedating the Uffizi altar-piece, the well-known panel in S. Michele at Lucca. In types, in colour, in form, this charming work stands just between the Corsini and Naples pictures on the one hand, and those of the Badia and Uffizi on the other.†

The drawings by Filippino which have come down to us are in quantity surpassed by few of his contemporaries, and in quality better than we should have expected. True, he does not appear, any more than in his paintings, as one of the great artists of the Florentine Quattrocento, but he certainly shows in his drawings far more spirit, more readiness, now and then greater strength, and often more refinement than most of his contemporaries. In his methods he follows closely upon his precursors Filippo, Sandro and Amico. He uses washes and white with similar pictorial purpose, if seldom with equal success. With the pen, however, he is scarcely left behind. He must have had nearly Leonardo's or Fra Bartolommeo's fondness for that simple instrument, and he uses it not, it is true,

\* I refer to the two Adorations by the young Botticelli, which the person responsible for the last edition of the National Gallery catalogue has left under their old absurd attribution to Filippino.

† Confirmation of the hypothesis that the Lucca picture is early, may be found in the fact that Filippino, during his stay at Lucca, formed there a sort of local following. A picture in the Lucca Academy by one of these disciples, showing distinct reminiscences of Filippino, is dated 1487. The master then must have been to Lucca before that year.

with the miraculous readiness of the one nor with the exquisite daintiness of the other—nor, be it added, with the fluent grace of Sandro—yet with a promptness and economy which his paintings would scarcely lead us to expect. Then for other reasons Filippino appears to great advantage in his drawings. In the Baroque itself, for instance, there is nothing inartistic; indeed, in the hands of real masters it is a style as fruitful perhaps as any. Filippino's Baroque, however, had little in common with the qualities of the genuine style, and much with its worst vices. These, I take it, were chiefly sins of extravagance, of wantonness—the vulgarity of the newly enriched, who feel life enhanced by the mere act of showy spending. And in his paintings Filippino squandered like a nabob, with a heady disorderliness, all the decorative motives which the heritage of antiquity, the hard earnings of his precursors, and his own fancy had put into his hands. In his drawings we are apt to get separately each of those motives, by themselves often so delightful, but so dizzy when piled up *pêle-mêle*, as, for instance, in the frescoes of the Strozzi Chapel.

Through the maze of a master's sketches we shall always find our way most easily, if we turn our first attention to those which certainly served for finished paintings still existing. The comparison which is thus instituted will reveal, as scarcely any other method of research can do, not only the qualities of the artist's work, but his personal mettle as well, and will besides furnish us with the desired standard for the appreciation of his unattachable, vagrant drawings.

Unfortunately we have but one important sketch for a picture still extant, painted by Filippino before that fatal Roman sojourn which, dowering him with a wealth of decorative motives copied from ancient monuments, turned his interest, as it always has turned the interest of feebler artists, away from the true purpose of art, to more or less senseless ornamentation. This sketch is for the head of the Madonna in the Vision of St. Bernard, in the Badia at Florence,\* Filippino's masterpiece, the last picture in which he still is a pure Quattrocentist, in which there is no touch of the baroque. The drawing [Uffizi, No. 139] is elaborately washed with bistre and carefully touched up with white, too carefully, with a resulting effect of dulness all the more surprising when contrasted with the delicate and expressive profile in the painting. In the latter the contours have a subtler swing, the hair is lighter, and the veil is more diaphanous, not, as in the sketch, crumpled up or drawn out into Filippino's more conventional folds. The design, however, served its purpose if it enabled the artist to avoid its mistakes, and, if less attractive, it is perhaps more vigorously modelled than the painting [Plate liv.].

The comparison between the fresco at the Minerva in Rome and a design in the British Museum which Filippino made for it will be instructive. The sketch with the pen and bistre wash is a complete work of art. It is not over finished, but retains the effect of a brilliant first thought. It would seem as if Lippi had just been studying Leonardo's Adoration of the Magi, and, if I do not mistake,

\* There is in the Uffizi a study for the Bernard as well, but of small interest (No. 129).

the arrangement of that pyramidal group of figures in action is mirrored in this sketch.\* In the fresco the Leonardesque liveliness of ordering has given place to the dull symmetry of Ghirlandajo and his kin, and instead of the buoyant figures we have heavy Italian burgesses, made heavier by the blanket-like drapery dear to Filippino, and posed apparently with the sole object that each one shall be well seen. I daresay the painter was not responsible for this. Doubtless various people wanted to be immortalised in the fresco, and still others insisted that the story and allegory should be made more obvious, and others yet, to make sure that no one ever should mistake their meaning, would have inscriptions everywhere. Instead, therefore, of angels floating delicately poised under a spacious portico of almost pure Tuscan art, the fresco shows a narrowish tribune of hybrid style, and upon its cornices tender infants supporting, at arm's length, huge tablets for ever above their heads. As for the execution, it would not be just to compare the two, but at its freshest and cleanest the painting never could have had qualities equivalent to those of the drawing—where the architecture is done with the spirit and charm of Guardi, and the figures in a way to remind us that, after all, Filippino was no unworthy pupil of Botticelli, no despicable contemporary of Leonardo† [Plate Iv.].

I have suggested that this sketch for the Triumph of St. Thomas betrays acquaintance with Leonardo's unfinished masterpiece, the Adoration of the Magi. In the altar-piece, now in the Uffizi, treating the same subject, Filippino's dependence on the work of his sublime contemporary is, of course, a matter of common knowledge. For one of the heads in this panel—for the man in the foreground to the right, with his hand held out—there is in the Ambrosiana at Milan an elaborately finished drawing, from the life perhaps, executed with the brush and bistre, standing out marble-like in bold relief from the paper washed dark brown. Fine this head is, and the hair is treated with a peculiar felicity, yet it is not of Leonardo which it reminds us, but of an artist more on Filippino's own level, of Leonardo's poor relation (in spirit), Lorenzo di Credi. There is about it something of the latter's sleek stupidity. Even less interesting is a study in the Uffizi [No. 1151] for the profile of the kneeling king, who holds the vase in his left hand.

It is a pity that no sketches remain for any other panel pictures painted after Filippino's return from Rome, particularly that none exist for two such noble works, executed doubtless very soon after 1490, as the *tondo* of the Sant' Angelo Collection at Naples (now in Boston, U.S.A.), and the altar-piece for Tanai di Nerli in S. Spirito at Florence. A number of Filippino's few best years were devoted to decorating with frescoes the Strozzi Chapel at S. Maria Novella. They were greatly admired for verisimilitude, touches of *genre*, and fanciful costumes, but more especially because of the multitude of motives, covering every available space,

\* Particularly in the lower part, to the right, the figure rushing up.

† In the Uffizi there is a poor but accurate copy (by an engraver?) after an original drawing by Filippino for the group to the left in the Assumption of the Virgin in the same Caraffa Chapel. In the ruined state of the painting this scrawl has a certain interest. Photo. Philpot, Florence, 2534.



copied or imitated from ancient monuments. All this was new then, and its mere novelty turned the spectator's head. Now, happily, the novelty has worn away, and while we still see in Filippino something of an innovator, we give scant admiration to the first adept of anarchy in art.

One might have supposed that his taste for the Baroque was a strong natural impulse. If it were this, surely Filippino's first thoughts, his drawings, would show at least as much tendency to *Seicentismo* as the paintings. Nothing of the sort! There are several drawings for this series of frescoes, and they are the work not of a great, but of a brilliant, still purely Fifteenth Century Florentine. Filippino therefore deliberately planned to be baroque, and carried out his programme not without labour.

Look at the large pen-sketch (in the Uffizi) for the Raising of Drusiana [Plate lvi.]. The arrangement is simple and unstudied. The figures are slim and graceful, dainty in action, with much about them of the buoyancy in Amico di Sandro's Story of Esther. In the architecture there scarcely is a suggestion of the Baroque, and nowhere, of course, the petty retailing of Antiquities. Then, as workmanship, what a ready, prompt pen! But how learned, and leaden, and swaddled it has all grown in the fresco! There is no motive whether of grace, or of mere action which in the fresco has not lost its point. Even the figures have become soft and podgy. Another drawing [Uffizi, No. 195] offers a similar instance. It is the study of a finely proportioned nude youth, well placed on his feet, bending over, and holding with both hands a staff as if to shove with it. Certainly this figure served for that of the man poking with a pole the fire in the Martyrdom of the Evangelist. But in the painting he has grown so heavy and dull that we scarcely recognise him. The least offensive figures in the Strozzi Chapel are the Muses to right and left of the window. The Parthenice is certainly very sweet, with a Leonardesque sweetness, yet most of us will prefer the few pen-strokes on a drawing at Berlin.\* Here the muse does not play herself but with a splendid gesture teaches the pipes and the lyre to two toilsome winged infants—a charming illustration, if ever there was one, and a masterpiece of unpremeditated pen-drawing.†

These few sketches have given us not only some insight into Filippino's character as an artist, but have revealed, with one exception, nearly all his phases as a draughtsman. That exception is his studies of draperies, to be seen in many drawings, where, although the figure is always present, it yet is more or less secondary to the draperies cast upon it. Some of these date from Filippino's earliest years, such as the one in the Uffizi [No. 1253] of two figures, one standing and the other kneeling before him, or as the one belonging to Herr von Beckerath, of a young man with a pen in his hand, or as yet another, at Dresden, of St.

\* This is in every probability a sketch for the group in the fresco, and certainly not for the picture at Berlin (78A) painted doubtless at this same time.

† Another sketch for this series is Uffizi 185. Still another belongs to Mr. Gathorne-Hardy. A drawing of four seated nudes at Lille, and a head at Windsor may also have served for these frescoes. (See catalogue under Filippino and respective places.) Yet another at Christ Church, Oxford.

Andrew reading in a book, with another person sitting beside him. In these and many like sketches one easily traces, through all the habits and mannerisms of technique—in the use of white for instance—and arrangement, the tradition of Filippo and Botticelli, and the immediate influence of Amico di Sandro. As draperies, they are treated somewhat more functionally than the group of paintings with which they are contemporary—I mean the Carmine frescoes and the panels at Naples, in the Florentine Corsini Collection, and at Lucca. In his later paintings, Filippino's draperies became less functional, more swaddling and blanket-like, but while his drawings did to some very slight extent follow the same course, they never ceased being draperies. This would again tend to prove that the bad taste of Lippi's later years was a matter of deliberate preference.

To judge by the paucity of existing drawings for the nude, this most vital subject in art could not have interested Filippino greatly, and indeed his paintings reveal but too clearly his lack of feeling for the undraped figure. Even these few drawings show slight mastery. From his earliest years, is one at Dresden [Plate lvii.] of a lank man with a staff in his hand. On the reverse of the fine draped youth belonging to Herr von Beckerath there is a nude, more robust than the one at Dresden, but scarcely a masterpiece. We already have noted the study for the man poking the fire in the Strozzi Chapel frescoes. At Lille, there is a sheet with four sprawling nudes, perhaps studies for the Patriarchs on the ceiling of this same chapel, these also of no very considerable merit. And this nearly exhausts Filippino's nudes.

He would scarcely have deserved to rank as a pupil of Botticelli and Amico, if he did not take a somewhat keener interest in movement and action. Studies for this and no other purpose are few, but they are of relatively high quality. As fine specimens as any are the drawing for the litter-bearers in the Raising of Drusiana [Uffizi, No. 185], another drawing in the Uffizi [No. 141] of three figures in various attitudes, and at Dresden the fine pen study of a shaggy-haired youth walking away with his left arm held out. In all such studies Filippino takes care that the feet shall seem elastic, and press the ground firmly, and that the calves of the legs shall fill well the hose stretched tight over the expanding muscles.

We already have had occasion to note a study for a head. They also are rare among Filippino's drawings. At Chantilly there is one for a boy, wearing a cap over his long hair, in style and technique close to Amico. At Chantilly again there is another head, this time of a middle-aged man, also an early work, Botticellian in technique and conception. Other specimens need scarcely be noted here.

Drawings of *grotteschi*, nearly all with the pen, form a fair part of Filippino's remaining sketches. In every probability they were copied by him, while in Rome, from the Antique. Badly as he used them, they are dainty in themselves, and show a delicate hand and a free pen.

Indeed the pen must have been his favourite instrument, as surely it also was

Botticelli's. Never does Filippino approach his master so closely as in a rhythmically fluent—almost you would say flowers, blown for a moment into human semblance—pen design for a Christ among the Doctors [Uffizi, No. 144]. Another sketch in the Uffizi (No. 142), this time for an altar-piece, brings with it no suggestion of a heavy and grimy painting such as, if ever executed, it surely became, but of the broad air spaces and genial warmth of a Giorgionesque idyll [Plate lviii.]. Or take the drawing in the Louvre for a "Pietà" with two Saints. How delicately the sentiment is conveyed, and how graceful the sweet helplessness of the dead Christ!

## II

The tradition of art developed by Filippo Lippi was destined to have a longer duration and to undergo the least change of any in Florence. Raffaellino del Garbo was in point of time at least as far away from Filippo as Granacci from Domenico Veneziano. But how little the last two have in common, how close in style are the two first! Lippi's following throughout the whole of the fifteenth century formed a school within the School of Florence, and from its canons no individual adept wandered far. Even Botticelli shook off the influence of the Naturalists at his earliest opportunity, and no other member of the school showed so much as an inclination to pass outside its pale. Nevertheless, in the opinion of many, the least original and least spirited person of the group, Raffaellino del Garbo, is supposed to have found the energy to cast off the artistic habits firmly riveted upon him, we are led to believe, by Filippino, and to have had the bad taste to leave Florentine art behind him, betaking himself to the prettiness and lifelessness of the feeblest Umbrians.

It is my conviction, however, that nothing of the sort happened, although I do not affirm its impossibility. The question whether one given Florentine, or more than one, actually painted the group of pictures generally attributed to Raffaellino del Garbo has for me but a remote interest. The material flesh-and-blood personality of painters is really the affair of archivists and historians, not of students of art. So without paying too much regard to the paladins of this controversy, such as Messrs. Cavalcaselle and Ulmann, or Messrs. Milanesi and Morelli, I will attempt to state how many artistic personalities seem to me to be covered by the name of Raffaellino del Garbo. The discussion, I may add, is not to be avoided, for a large number of drawings are catalogued under this rubric.

Let me say at once that of artistic personalities I can discern only two in the group of paintings in question, but in the adherent group of drawings as many as three. Thus, Garbo, Capponi and Carli are neither the same person, nor yet three different ones. Artistically, at all events, whatever they may have been *nel secolo*, in the flesh—Capponi and Carli were identical, and perfectly distinct from Garbo. (For convenience I shall speak of Capponi-Carli as Carli.) The third personality



not discernible in the pictures, but clearly distinguishable in the drawings has nothing to do with either Garbo or Carli, and, for reasons to be stated later, I shall speak of him as *Alunno di Domenico*.

The entire problem has been obscured at the start by the assumption that Raffaellino's earliest works are two altar-pieces now in the Berlin Gallery, a Madonna enthroned with two angels, two saints standing and two others kneeling [No. 87], and another Madonna enthroned with two angels, St. Andrew and St. Sebastian [No. 98]. Both these panels are inferior performances of Filippino's workshop, executed by journeymen called in for the occasion, as was the custom in Florence, when a painter of high standing had a press of work. I make no doubt that the two altar-pieces were painted by different hands, and still more that several years elapsed between them. The earlier of the two is the Madonna with St. Sebastian and St. Andrew, and antedates Filippino's journey to Rome. This seems to me established by the simplicity of the arrangement, by the fact that Filippino's original drawing for the St. Andrew (Dresden) is early, and by the further fact that Sebastian has considerable resemblance to the same saint in the Lucca altar-piece, and even more to the early drawing of a youth holding a pen, in Herr von Beckerath's Collection. Here it may be said, "But all this does not prevent the Berlin picture from having been painted by Raffaellino." No, but there are other considerations. According to all accounts Garbo was the follower of none but Filippino, whose style his own earliest so closely resembled, says Vasari, that you scarcely could tell the difference. The altar-piece in question was executed on Filippino's sketches, and in his *atelier*, and therefore as a matter of course bears considerable resemblance to Filippino in the rough shapes of things. But I should think little of the natural endowment for our studies, and of the training of the person who could for a moment mistake this miserable performance for Filippino's. Moreover, in essential style, I here discern a different tradition, the hand of a poor craftsman, reared under other masters than Filippino. The Madonna's head, for instance, has more of Ghirlandajo's manner. Neither the Child's head nor that of the angel exactly above him are as Filippinesque as they should be. The heads of the saints remind me strangely of a certain journeyman painter among my Quattrocento acquaintances, and that reminder is strengthened by the colouring and the landscape. The painter I refer to is Jacopo del Sellajo, the pupil of Filippo Lippi whom I know to have worked for Ghirlandajo, and under Botticelli.\* It is not improbable that relatively fresh from Ghirlandajo and in want of a job, Sellajo executed this altar-piece for Filippino, following the sketches as faithfully as he could, but debasing everything to his own coinage, and occasionally letting the ass's ears peer out from under the lion's skin. As for the other altar-piece, supposed to have been executed for Filippino by Raffaellino, it

\* The Deposition and the Epiphany once at Badia à Settimo, where they passed perhaps from the very beginning for Ghirlandajo's, now in the Cenacolo di S. Apollonia, were certainly executed by Sellajo. Botticellian works by him may be seen at M. Gustave Dreyfus', and at M. Leon Bonnat's in Paris, as well, of course, as the four Triumphs in Sant' Ansano at Fiesole, the Venus in the National Gallery, and the other Venus in the Louvre.

is of even worse quality. Let a person look candidly at this wretched affair, and then say that the executant reveals great promise! And yet great promise is precisely what Raffaellino's very earliest works did give to contemporaries. But if really Raffaellino's, this panel could not be a very early work. The Madonna here bears no likeness to any of those painted by Filippino before his Roman period. She has, on the contrary, considerable resemblance to the Madonna in the S. Spirito altar-piece, or to the one in the S. Angelo tondo. Filippino therefore must have furnished the sketches for the Berlin picture only after his return from Rome. Now as this was no earlier than 1490, at the earliest, Raffaellino must then have been about four and twenty. I ask again whether this is the sort of work to expect from a painter who seems to have given great promise of himself, doubtless before reaching an age relatively so mature? All, however, is possible, and despite contrary expectation, I should not hesitate to admit Raffaellino's hand here, provided I could anywhere descry it. I simply cannot. I can discover nowhere a touch betraying Raffaellino. I can discern no hand but that of a stupid journeyman, who also worked for others as well as for Filippino, as we may infer from the cherubs and from the Child. These are not Filippinesque, and I do not know what they are. But I must draw attention to the curious fact that the Child here and the one in Lo Spagna's earliest altar-piece [Perugia, Sala xi. 7, Photo. Alinari] could not have been designed independently one of the other.

Happily there exists a work by Raffaellino, the attribution of which to him will be questioned by no competent and careful student, a work of a quality scarcely, if at all, inferior to Filippino's, and of a style so close to this master as at first glance to seem certainly his. Before this picture we can appreciate the justice and bearing of Vasari's statement about Raffaellino. One who painted thus in his youth might have been expected to do great things in his best years.

This work is a tondo belonging to Herr J. Simon of Berlin, and represents the Madonna in a room under a window, behind a bench, stooping a little to embrace the Child while two angels kneel in adoration. The arrangement is more charming than any of Filippino's. Indeed the space of the tondo is filled with a felicity which, to the superstitious, might suggest the existence of a magic efficacy in the mere name of Raphael, and in the grace of the angel there is also a sort of anticipation of Sanzio. It is in these points that we may distinguish this tondo from any possible work by Filippino. Then here Raffaellino already attempts to be more intimate in feeling than his master. Indeed the sentiment expressed in the action of the Mother and the Child vividly recalls Botticelli. The draperies approach Filippino's as closely as may be, but are somewhat less well drawn. The Raffaellino of maturer date reveals himself most clearly in the contours, in the shape of the feeble hands, and in the greyish colouring. This tondo in short, introduces us to a somewhat feebler, but, on the other hand, somewhat more charming Filippino.

We may assume that this work was executed while Raffaellino was still either

in Filippino's shop, or, at all events, warmly imbued with the latter's influence. Not many years could have elapsed before he painted a work in which he already is quite himself, and in which he was destined to reach his highest limit. This is the tondo in Berlin [No. 90], a composition essentially like Herr Simon's, but taken out of doors, the figures erect, and everything even gentler, suaver, more gracious. Without a touch to betray Umbrian influence, one yet breathes here the air that one has loved in Perugino, but never found in a Florentine. How Raphaelesque is the arrangement of the Virgin with the Child! It calls to mind the "Granduca," and even more forcibly the Sixtine Madonna, but is of purest Valdarno breed nevertheless, the direct descendant of Donatello and Lucca della Robbia. Raffaellino remains, however, a feeble draughtsman although his outlines are not without a certain charm. He has rid himself of Filippino's blanket-like draperies. His own are light, and wave easily, like gauze in the breeze.

Yet another tondo of the same kind and style, but showing an even further departure in sentiment from Filippino is the one which belongs to Mr. Robert Benson of London.\* In composition, however, it is but an improvement upon Filippino's Sant' Angelo tondo. The Madonna holds in her lap the Child, who eagerly grasps the pomegranate which an angel offers Him. At the same time she caresses the cheek of the infant John. On the right is another angel. Here the arrangement again reminds us of Raphael, but this time of the "Terranuova Madonna" [Berlin, No. 247A].† The Madonna's head brings to mind still another artist, this time Botticelli. Its shape and poise make it seem like a much sweetened version of the Madonna in Sandro's "Magnificat" [Uffizi, No. 1267B]. It closely resembles many heads in pictures executed in Botticelli's shop during the last decade of the fifteenth century, such as the Madonna in the Villa Nuti at Florence, or the one belonging to Baron Chiaramonte-Bordonaro at Palermo [Photo. Alinari], or yet another at Turin [No. 99]. In the angel's profile also, and in the unusually smooth flow of the draperies there is again a touch of Sandro.

I have thus far mentioned but three pictures whose attribution to Garbo could not possibly call forth a contrary opinion. There remains but one other work which is universally accepted as his, and even when we shall have added several others, we are left with but scanty traces of Raffaellino's activity. The one indisputable picture is the Resurrection painted for the Capponi for their chapel at Monteoliveto, and now in the Florence Academy. Vasari wastes his breath praising it, for it is a feeble performance telling a tale of woeful decline—a decline to which the artist could not have sunk in less than a considerable interval of time.

\* Reproduced in the Portfolio of the New Gallery Exhibition of 1894.

† The question may be asked whether Raffaellino may not have painted this, and the Berlin tondo under the inspiration of Raphael while the latter was in Florence. But the answer must be in the negative. For these tondi must be from Raffaellino's earliest independent activity, and date scarcely later than 1495—or the tradition recorded by Vasari of Garbo's fascinating promise and subsequent failure, a tradition which seems amply justified, all considered, would lose its meaning. But Raphael could not have made himself felt, in Florence, at least, before 1504. The influence may conceivably have flowed the other way, for Raphael was not above learning from any one whose art was congenial to his own. As for the motive of the Madonna with the infant Baptist at her knee, which has been claimed as exclusively Umbrian, it is Florentine, and occurs in Umbria for the first time, I believe, in Pinturicchio's Polyptych at Perugia, dated 1498.



What was he doing meanwhile? Several pictures fill the gap, most of them so Botticellian in character that they still pass for Sandro's. It occurs to me, therefore, to suppose that possibly Raffaellino, soon after 1490, may have been taken as assistant by Botticelli, to superintend, while he himself was frequenting religious and revolutionary conventicles, the manufacture of pictures chiefly for private devotion, for which Savonarola's revival probably caused a greatly increased demand.\* My supposition owes whatever value it may have to the fact that in all his later works Raffaellino's colouring and technique have singular affinities with the later phases of Botticelli (as if he had found occasion to be broken in to the latter's habits), and to the conviction which, despite my efforts for years to shake it off, will persist that Raffaellino executed, entirely on Sandro's cartoon, however, the famous "Pietà" at Munich [No. 1010], still almost universally ascribed to Botticelli. Here Garbo's hand seems to me evident in the treatment of the draperies, in the form of the hands, in the technique, and in the colouring. Almost opposite hangs the "Pietà" which is now almost unanimously, and properly, ascribed to Raffaellino [No. 1009]. The more frequently I have compared the two in essentials, the stronger has become my persuasion that they were both by the same hand, painted the one on Botticelli's cartoon, as I have said, and the other not very long after, but when Garbo had already left Sandro's shop.

But I shall delay speaking of this picture and its kin until we have examined the few paintings which are of earlier date. First must come the bust of a young man at Lyons (No. 51), there most correctly described as of the Florentine School, but surely, as the drawing of the features, the contours, the landscape and the technique sufficiently indicate, by Raffaellino.† This is still Filippinesque, but it was soon followed by two profiles of ladies which have enough of the Botticellian air to make them pass, as I have said, for Sandro's. The earlier one, more obviously Garbo's, went at the Dudley Sale into the collection of Baron Alphonse de Rothschild.‡ A comparison of this profile with the angel's profile in Mr. Benson's tondo, of the timid contours with those in Garbo's early pictures, of the hair and drapery also, must bring conviction to any one who has the rare eye, and the rarer training for these our much abused studies, that Garbo was its author.§ Slightly more Botticellian is the profile at Berlin [No. 81] there ascribed to Sandro himself. For the latter it is far too characterless and feeble. Trying to view it as Botticelli's, you swing to the opposite extreme and regard it as of a conception and a quality no better than Mainardi's. But thus we should do this panel wrong;

\* This would account for the great quantity of Madonnas from Botticelli's *atelier* still existing. The fact that he was an active *Piagnone*, while it prevented his turning out much with his own hand, may have drawn all his brethren to his shop.

† Reproduced (very badly) in "L'Arte," i. p. 302.

‡ Reproduced in the catalogue of the sale, and as frontispiece to Mr. Maurice Hewlett's "Earthwork out of Tuscany" (London, Dent and Co.). Should this be, as seems probable, the bust seen by Signor Cavalcaselle in the Barker Collection (*Storia di Pittura*, vii. 154), then he already identified it as Raffaellino's, which would give me great pleasure, for, saving Morelli, there is no one whom I should rather have on my side.

§ Cf. further in general, and point by point, this profile with that of the Magdalen in the drawing—by no one disputed—at Christ Church.

for, greatly below Sandro as it is, nevertheless we therein discern, if but indirectly, his ideal of loveliness, and not as in Mainardi the ideal of the mediocre Ghirlandajo. But what is there in this profile that is not a sign-mark of Raffaellino's hand, from the contours to the treatment of the folds in the kerchief, from the arrangement of the hair to the drawing of the eye, and of the small mouth with its full lips?

Certainly no less Botticellian than these two profiles are two busts, both ascribed to this painter, which Morelli already has identified as Raffaellino's.\* I should place them after the profiles, and nearer to the Resurrection. The more obvious of the two is the portrait, if I mistake not, of Lorenzo il Magnifico, in the collection of Lady Layard at Venice [Photo. Alinari]. Here the form of the hand and the landscape leave no possible doubt that it is a work by Raffaellino executed not long before his "Pietà" (now at Munich) and his Resurrection. The colour-scheme and the technique are, however, more Botticellian than in Garbo's earlier or indeed later phases, resembling Sandro's manner at about 1500. The other bust is of a young man at Berlin [No. 78]. The colour and technique here are as in the last picture, but aside from these, the treatment of the hair, and the mouth are enough to establish Raffaellino's authorship.†

There remain but three more pictures which with perfect certainty can be made to pass under the rubric of Raffaellino del Garbo. All of them indicate a departure from Botticelli and a return either to renewed contact with, or to early habits acquired under Filippino. The landscapes in all three pictures would rather urge the former alternative, as on the whole they have more affinities with those in Filippino's later works. With one exception, they all indicate a singular and almost incomprehensible decline from the beautiful tondi which, early in his career, promised so much.

That one exception, the most Botticellian work of this group, is a tondo with which I am acquainted through a photograph only [Brogi, 6434]. The original, ascribed to Sandro, passed, it is said, some five and twenty years ago from the Foresi Collection of Florence into that of Mr. Duncan of Glasgow.‡ The composition vividly recalls Filippino's S. Angelo tondo, having the same number of figures, and nearly the same arrangement, but, instead of Joseph and Margaret, two angels. The Child is very Filippinesque, even to the draperies which hang loosely about him. The other figures are more Botticellian, but when you look closer you cannot fail to perceive that they are Garbo's. The Virgin, for instance, is scarcely more Botticellian than in the Benson tondo. The angel with the open book is surely by the hand that painted the angel similarly placed in the Berlin tondo, and drew the Margaret in the Christ Church design for a tondo—of which more hereafter. The curtains and the landscape are almost the same as in the Layard Portrait. But it is the folds of the draperies, ribbon- or gauze-like, which

\* Galerie zu Berlin, p. 13.

† Cf. also the bust at Lyons, and in colour and technique both the Layard and Berlin busts, and the "Pietà" (ascribed to Botticelli) at Munich.

‡ As my friend, Mr. Kerr-Lawson tells me, it now belongs to Mrs. Welker of West Calder, N.B.

most firmly stamp this work as Garbo's. Raffaellino must have painted it just after he had ceased working with Sandro and was beginning to return to his Filippinesque habits and conventions.

By far the less unpleasant of the remaining two is yet another tondo, at Naples [Scuola Romana, No. 15, Photo. Brogi 6900], there, not altogether without cause, ascribed to Lo Spagna, but nevertheless accepted by all critics of authority as Garbo's. The attribution to Lo Spagna was given doubtless by some one who felt the Raphaelesque charm of this work. It represents the Madonna sitting in a delightful landscape with the Child turning to the infant John. It is a picture which as an illustration has great charm because of the exquisite sweetness of the Virgin's face, if for no other reason. It has considerable merit also as a composition—note how the Madonna is grouped with the trees above her—but that is all.

At Munich there is a "Pietà" [No. 1009] surely the one seen by Vasari at S. Spirito—there still labelled as Filippino's, but even in the catalogue of that gallery accepted as Garbo's. It is an unequal work, harsh in colour and not free from caricature. The Madonna's face and the angels still recall the younger Raffaellino. Indeed, the face is but a sweetened version of the Madonna in Filippino's Uffizi altar-piece [No. 1268]. On the other hand, the Magdalen and the landscape have more in common with Filippino's latest style. As for the Resurrection, to which we now return for an instant, it must be placed, both in point of date and as quality, last of all. It is lifeless in action, crude in colour, and has indeed small qualities to redeem its great faults, and these qualities are in the landscape.

By a calculation which I silently have been making all the while, I should judge that this last work which I can bring into connection with the artistic personality of Raffaellino del Garbo was painted about 1505\*. Now Raffaellino is supposed to have lingered on in the flesh until 1524, for nineteen years, that is to say, after his artistic personality had ceased to exist. What the flesh-and-blood Garbo did with himself in these years I cannot surmise, and happily it is not my concern. But did he really linger on so late? We have no word for this but Vasari's, and as Vasari most unconsciously joined on Carli's artistic personality to Garbo's, why should he not have played the same trick with their social, citizen selves? So it is quite possible that the real Garbo died a youngish man, ailing perhaps in his last years—which would account for the decline in his art.

### III

Contemporary with Garbo, there happened to be in Florence nearly a score of other painters named Raffaellino. Now it would scarcely be compatible with the laws of chance—particularly when we consider that towards 1500 that coalescence

\* As an item in my reasoning I may mention the fact that the head of St. Lawrence in Carli's altar-piece at S. Spirito dated 1505, is an imitation of the head of the young evangelist in Garbo's Munich "Pietà."



and reunion of the various sects of painters which was soon to leave in Florence but one school, the Michelangelo-Sartesque, had already begun—if among this score of Raffaellinos one did not happen to have a manner resembling Garbo's. In fact there did happen to be such a Raffaele, who, when at home, signed his pictures as "Carli" or "Capponi," and when abroad, as "Raphael of Florence." Why he chose to bear two distinct names when at home, is a question which I gladly leave to the decision of those whose study is biography, although I may presently offer a suggestion. For us students of art this matter would not, of course, have the slightest interest, if it were not that Morelli had for once been misled into the belief that a difference of words must needs signify a difference of things, and concluded that the names Carli and Capponi represented distinct artistic personalities. That they were the same will, I trust, appear with sufficient clearness in the course of this section.

Carli's manner in his best years, those which immediately followed the opening of the new century, certainly has much superficial resemblance to Garbo's. As the latter's activity was in all probability followed by the former's, I scarcely wonder that Carli's artistic personality was first coalesced, and then, as by Vasari, identified with Garbo's. It is a singular fact in this connection that of ten works, mentioned by Vasari as Garbo's, which still exist or are traceable, eight are Carli's, and that the drawings for embroideries, also ascribed by Messer Giorgio to the one, are, so far as I am aware, all by the other.

But close as Carli is to Garbo in these years when, despite his being a Florentine with leanings towards Filippino and Garbo himself, he was more than half Umbrian, his beginnings, if I do not mistake them, show him in a very different light. These beginnings may be seen, I think, in two altar-pieces at S. Spirito\* in Florence, and one in the cathedral at Volterra,† all of a character and even composition, so identical that they may well be treated together. From these panels it would appear that their author was a somewhat helpless journeyman painter who probably had got his first training under Cosimo Rosselli, had worked also with Credi, but now was chiefly under Ghirlandajo's influence. The best of them is the one at Volterra, and, as they are nearly replicas of one another, we can confine our attention to this example. Throughout Carli's career there is nothing which is so constantly characteristic of him as his treatment of draperies. Of course his folds are seldom functional, nor are they calligraphic. Under Umbrian influence he improved, but even to the end his draperies betray the person who acquired his convention from Ghirlandajo. Those who will take the trouble to look at the folds covering the knees of the Virgin in Carli's Corsini altar-piece, and compare them with

\* South transept, east wall, first altar: Madonna with two angels, the Evangelist and St. Bartholomew. South transept, south wall, first altar left: Madonna with two angels, SS. Nicholas and Bartholomew, and two busts of donors. The only mention I can readily find of these pictures is in Fantozzi's "Guida di Firenze" where they are ascribed, the first to the School of Botticelli, and the second to Antonio del Pollajuolo.

† Chapel of St. Carlo: Madonna with two angels, SS. Anthony Abbot and Peter Martyr. In the lunette God the Father. Also a predella. Ascribed to Fra Filippo. Photo. Alinari (11730).

those in such a work of Ghirlandajo's shop as the Madonna with St. Francis and a Bishop, at Berlin (Photo. Hanfstängl), will understand what I mean. But here at Volterra, and in the other earliest pictures, Carli's folds are a stupid caricature of that manner, tending to be close and parallel, and purposeless. The action of the Child already anticipates the Child in the Corsini altar-piece. The movement of the angels recalls a drawing of later date, but by Carli, at Weimar. The entire lunette naturally reminds us of the one in the altar-piece of S. Maria degli Angeli at Siena. The colour is in every respect an anticipation of his later manner.

It is perhaps not impossible to fix a date for this precious work. Ghirlandajo, as is attested by his altar-piece there, must, in 1492, have been working at Volterra. If we compare the folds over the Madonna's knees, in the picture which I would ascribe to Carli, with the similarly placed folds on the Christ in Ghirlandajo's work, we shall be tempted to believe that Carli must have painted the last also, of course as Ghirlandajo's assistant. In that case, once at Volterra he might have remained there to do an altar-piece on his own account. If, as is assumed, he was born about 1470, he surely was of an age in 1492 to be competent for such an humble performance as this picture.

By the same hand, although after a lapse of two or three years, is the Visitation in S. Proculo at Florence, ascribed to Ghirlandajo himself. The composition is, indeed, like Ghirlandajo's in the fresco at S. Maria Novella, or more still like the panel in the Louvre, only that at S. Proculo there are two angels kneeling and two saints besides. The angels and the saint with the long beard resemble the figures in the Volterra picture. On the other hand, the head of the younger saint anticipates the head of the St. Lawrence in the S. Spirito altar-piece, dated 1505, or, more still, the original drawing in the Uffizi for that head. The draperies are quite the same as at Volterra.

If these several works are by Carli, as is probable, then he was, to start with, a follower of Ghirlandajo, and this hypothesis is not weakened by the fact that the original drawing, just mentioned, for the Lawrence in the S. Spirito picture of 1505, still passes almost unquestioned as Ghirlandajo's, and is, indeed, not at first glance to be distinguished from Domenico's own.

Thereafter, say no later than 1495, Carli must have become the assistant of Perugino, working for him, doubtless changing quarters along with this master, and altogether conforming himself to his style. When he reappears it is as an Umbrian painter with strong reminiscences of Florence. He comes to light again, if I mistake not, in a rather enigmatical picture which used to be at S. Matteo (where its predelle still remain) but is now transferred to the Museo Civico, at Pisa. (Photo. Alinari, 8899.) Signor Cavalcaselle has already attributed this work to Raffaellino del Garbo, and has thus, at all events, brought it into our group. Here the Madonna, the Evangelist and Jerome are distinctly Umbrian. The Baptist has something of Botticelli about him, although he also is Umbrian. The Bishop closely resembles the St. Zanobi in the altar-piece formerly at S. Maria

Nuova, signed "Capponi." The angels go back to the Volterra altar-piece. The way the bust of the donoress is put in, reminds one of the early picture in S. Spirito, and, as painting, of the portraits in the pictures signed Capponi.\*

If all these pictures are, as seems to me highly probable, by the same hand, then it must be confessed that this hand was neither steady nor clearly guided. In the next work, however, Carli's artistic personality appears no longer dubiously in spite of the singular fact that it is signed "Capponi." It is an altar-piece formerly in S. Maria Nuova (now in the Uffizi), dated 1500, representing the Madonna enthroned in the open air under a baldachin, with St. Zanobi to the right, and to the left St. Francis, protecting a kneeling donor, whose wife kneels facing him. It is a work of no power, but it is pleasant, not lacking in that charm which painters bred in Umbria knew how to infuse into their landscapes, while, in the portraits, it is quite creditable. With Garbo there is here little in common except a touch of the sweetish sentiment, and an accidental resemblance, of no striking sort, however, in the portraits. These are the best part of the painting, as the worst are the draperies, particularly over the Virgin's knees, which remind us of the folds in the Volterra picture.† The Umbrian character of the whole, from the arrangement and composition to the landscape and the forms, is too obvious to need comment.

In the work of 1500 just described, it pleased our painter to call himself Capponi. In a picture dated 1501 he calls himself Carli. This is that Mass of Pope Gregory which Vasari saw in S. Spirito and ascribed to Garbo.‡ Before an altar, Umbrian-wise in the open air, St. Gregory, at the moment of the elevation, while two torch-bearing angels are swinging censers, and two deacons kneeling, beholds Christ carrying His cross. The arrangement, and the suggestion of such a solemn service taking place out of doors, amidst gentle shapes of hills, and under golden skies, are delightful. Unfortunately the figures lack grace, and the Christ is too unworthy of the scene. But all this is by the way. The question of interest is whether this work is by the same hand as that which painted the one at S. Maria Nuova. It is, decidedly. Note the almost perfect identity, particularly with regard to the drawing of the lowered eyelids, between the Madonna in this and the angel to the right in that. The landscapes in both are of the same spirit, and of nearly the same form. And, more decisive still, the folds of the St. Francis in the one and of the angels in the other are of the same character.

In the following year, in 1502, Carli, signing that name, painted a picture of the Madonna enthroned between two adoring angels, St. Bartholomew and St. Jerome, which Vasari also saw at S. Spirito, and also attributed to Garbo. It is

\* There is in the Pisa Gallery another picture by Carli, but small and of slight value. It represents worshippers having a vision (Sala vi. 15).

† Note in the S. Maria Nuova picture that the masks decorating the bases of the throne have a distinct resemblance to those on the high balustrade in the one at Volterra; note also that in the former work a small picture of Christ on the Cross is introduced exactly as in the S. Spirito altar-piece with the Madonna, the Evangelist and the Baptist.

‡ It now belongs to Mr. Robert Benson of London, and has been photographed by the New Gallery.



now in the Corsini Gallery at Florence [Photo. Alinari 4200]. In style it is even more Umbrian than the two last pictures, and we may assume therefore that his contact with Perugino and his school, rather than severed, was even tightened. Now we need not dwell on the points of resemblance between this picture and the last, also signed "Carli," for, as a matter of course, we expect them. Nevertheless the points of likeness between the two works bearing the same signature are nothing like so many, or so striking, as between the Corsini picture signed Carli, and the one at S. Maria Nuova inscribed "Capponi." The Madonnas in both are nearly identical in type and in action. Only slightly less alike are the Children, the one in the earlier picture being a trifle less Peruginesque. The hands and the draperies in both the Virgins are quite the same. Then note the arrangement: it is exactly the same in both, only that in the one two angels take the place of the saints in the other, and the kneeling saints replace the kneeling donors.

We may conclude, therefore, as all must who understand the methods of research required in this task, and the nature of evidence therein, that the same hand painted the pictures which it signed once with the name of "Capponi" and twice with that of Carli. We shall consider this point decided although occasionally we may return to it, as we are studying Carli's further works.

The next in order is an altar-piece in S. Maria degli Angeli at Siena, inscribed "Raphael de Florentia pinxit 1502" [Photo. Lombardi, Siena]. The Madonna sits in a glory, raised not very high above the ground, between SS. Augustin and John the Evangelist, the Magdalen and Jerome. Above in the lunette is a God the Father among cherubs. Below is a predella wherein are represented the Adoration of the Magi, and various hermit saints. The Madonna is as purely Umbrian as if she had been painted by Eusebio di S. Giorgio; the Magdalen as if by Spagna. Umbrian also are the predelle, even more than those which, separated from their altar-piece, still remain at S. Matteo, in Pisa. But the male saints and God the Father are Florentine, as Ghirlandajesque almost as is Ridolfo, or more still, as Raffaele Botticini. Indeed there has been talk of ascribing this work to the last mentioned craftsman; but that would be a mistake, for he never is Umbrian, and he expresses an altogether different sentiment. On the other hand, there can be no doubt that Carli was its author—signing himself when away from home as "from Florence," a designation which of course, provided it sufficed, would, among strangers, serve its purpose better than a patronymic. We shall easily establish his claim to this altar-piece if we compare it with the pictures we already have examined. Here at Siena he is even more Umbrian than in the Corsini picture, and it would seem as if, in the interval between them, he had passed some months at Perugia, there falling, as Eusebio and Lo Spagna at the same time, under the young Raphael's spell. But let us look closer. The cherubs are identical with those in the Corsini picture, and so also are the hands of the Madonna and the draperies over her knees, as well as the profile of St. Jerome. Perhaps nothing in Carli is so characteristic as in the S. Maria Nuova panel, the

folds on the right arm of St. Francis. You will find an identical sweep of folds in the sleeves of the Evangelist and of the Magdalen in the Siena altar-piece. The landscapes in both these works also have much in common.

The next painting by Carli which bears a date—it is 1505—is an altar-piece in the south transept of S. Spirito which used to be ascribed variously and nonsensically. Recently there has been a sort of agreement to attribute it to Garbo, with whom it has but a remote connection. It represents, as in the S. Maria Nuova picture, the Madonna enthroned in the open air, here by the shore of the sea, with SS. Stephen and Bernard sitting to the right, St. Lawrence and the Evangelist to the left, while two *putti* are drawing away a curtain from this theophany. In the predella below are five scenes: the Martyrdoms of the Evangelist, Lawrence and Stephen, the Pietà, and the Madonna appearing to St. Bernard [Photo. Alinari 4122]. The Madonna and the Child are essentially the same as in the works of 1502. The Evangelist accompanied by his eagle is identical with this saint in the Siena altar-piece. Bernard is evidently an imitation of the one by Perugino, now at Munich, but formerly in this church. The two deacons, on the other hand, are more Ghirlandajesque, and the drawing in the Uffizi for the head of Lawrence actually passes, as I already have had occasion to observe, under Ghirlandajo's name. In the predelle, however, there is no uncertain note. They are pure Umbrian in types and forms and even more in the technique and the golden colouring. It would seem, moreover, to judge by these predelle and by the landscape, that at this time Carli might have been seeing much of another Tuscan turned Umbrian, Gerino da Pistoja. Finally, before leaving this picture, I must point out that the hands and the folds leave no doubt that its author was he who signed himself both "Capponi" and "Carli." Compare, to choose but one example, the folds here on the arms of the Evangelist, Lawrence and the Madonna with the folds on the arm of Francis in the S. Maria Nuova picture.

At about the same time as this altar-piece at S. Spirito,\* Carli must have painted his most considerable work, a fresco this time, which Vasari, ascribing it to Garbo, mentions as existing in the Cestello.† There it still remains, although removed from its place and cut up into three fragments. It represents the Miracle of the Loaves and Fishes. The figures are life size and all have a certain Umbrian grace. Christ and the Apostles recall Perugino's in the Sistine Chapel. Some of the figures are excellent portraits. The crouching women are exquisitely pretty. The child who reaches up to Christ for bread is charming. The landscape background with its view of a port, the shore, and castles is delightful. There can be no question that this is Carli's work. This fact is attested by the types—one of the distributors, for instance, is like the Lawrence at S. Spirito, the child on

\* It is perhaps not without interest to note that this makes five altar-pieces painted by Carli for that church—a church which, as almost no other, employed inferior painters.

† Now in the school-house, next entrance to Perugino's fresco at S. Maria Maddalena dei Pazzi.

the extreme left is like the *putti* in the same picture—the colouring, and above all by the draperies.\*

Now hitherto a discerning eye, trained to understand what points of similarity are significant, and what are not, has scarcely found a touch of Garbo in Carli's works. But soon after 1505 a likeness begins to appear at times strong enough to somewhat excuse their having been run together. Before this date for about ten years, off and on, Carli must have been in close contact with Perugino or other Umbrians. After this he seems to have lacked their influence, and being a dependent creature, and not energetic, gravitated toward that form of art which happened to be most like the Umbrian and his own—Raffaellino del Garbo's. And, in consequence, Carli's later pictures might be mistaken for Garbo's. Thus, clearly as I now see that the Naples tondo of which I spoke some time ago as Garbo's is not by Carli, and that a Coronation of which I shall speak presently, is not Garbo's but Carli's, it has taken long and reiterated study to bring me to my present state of certainty.

This Coronation, highly praised by Vasari, who ascribes it, as does the Louvre Catalogue, to Garbo, was painted for S. Salvi and is now in the Louvre [No. 1303 Photo. Braun]. In the midst of music-making and flower-strewing angels, Christ crowns His Mother, while on the earth below stand in calm adoration SS. Benedict, John Gualberto and Bernard Uberti. The angels and the Madonna's face have something of Garbo's grace and daintiness, but Carli betrays himself clearly enough in more significant points, in the colouring, in the ears,<sup>†</sup> in the hands,<sup>‡</sup> and most of all in the draperies. The cherubs are perfectly identical with those in the Siena and the Corsini pictures. In the arrangement of the actual coronation there is every resemblance to this treatment of the subject by Ridolfo Ghirlandajo, now in the Louvre [No. 1324], which would imply that Garbo was returning to the influences of his earlier years.§ At Vallombrosa there is a panel dated June 1508. It represents St. John Gualbert enthroned between Bernard and Catherine, the Baptist and the Magdalen. Ascribed to Garbo, it nevertheless is Carli's. The types, the forms, and the draperies recall him. The Magdalen, indeed, is a faithful repetition of the same figure in the Siena altar-piece—for which reason Signor Cavalcaselle [Storia vii. 174] ascribes it to the same

\* After the above paragraph was written, and years after I had concluded that this fresco was Carli's, Mr. Herbert P. Horne was good enough to show me the following extract from a document, which he permits me to publish. It will be seen that I was wholly right in the attribution, and but a hair's-breadth out in the date:

1503. *Quest' Anno si fece dipingere la facciata del Refettorio di Cestello da Raffaello di Bart<sup>o</sup> Carli per D40, ove dipinse il Miracolo de Cinque Pani.*

R. Archivio di Stato, Firenze.

*Conventi Soppressi*, Badia di Settimo. Filza C. XVIII. No. 18, sec. S:

"Memorie del Monasterio di Settimo dal . . . Anno 1236, raccolte da varij fragmenti di piu scritture antiche per me D. Ignatio Signorini." fol. 66 tergo.

As the writer lived in the latter part of the seventeenth century, we may rely on the genuineness of his information, for no one at that time would have had an object in attributing so respectable a work to a painter so obscure.

† Cf. St. Gregory.

‡ Cf. St. Bartholomew's in the Corsini picture with those here of St. Benedict's right and St. Bernard's left.

§ Only the accidental fact—dictated in each case, and not in the artist's choice—of there being four saints in each has made certain writers approach this work to Botticelli's Coronation (Florence Academy.)



author, Raffaele da Firenze. But, as we are persuaded that the latter was Carli, we have the authority of the great critic on our side. The Vallombrosa picture, it should be added, has more archæological than æsthetical interest.

The very pleasant figures of SS. Roch and Ignatius which Vasari saw in the Cestello and attributed to Garbo, are still there and must have been painted soon after the last work. They are beautifully golden in colour. In S. Ambrogio, on the first altar to the right, there is a panel by Carli which Signor Cavalcaselle ascribes, of course, to Garbo. In style it really does approach the last-named master in the sense in which the Coronation does. The subject is St. Ambrose enthroned, with Nicholas on one side, and on the other Tobias and the Angel. In the lunette there is an Annunciation. The dealer Simonetti in Rome has, or recently had, a Holy Family with a singularly young Joseph upon whose budding staff a dove is resting. To this period also of Carli's career belong several tondi. The finest of them is one recently acquired as a Pintoricchio by the Poldi-Pezzoli Museum at Milán [No. 210, Photo. Dubray]. The Madonna holds the Child who blesses the infant John. She is sweet and tender. The composition suggests Raphael's Granduca Madonna. The forms, the landscape, and the colouring are thoroughly characteristic of Carli. A similar work of slightly later date is to be seen in the Academy at Düsseldorf [No. 120]. Yet another, but inferior, is at Dresden [No. 21, Photo. Tamme], the Madonna between SS. Francis and Jerome. Though feeble, it is a sweet and characteristic work by Carli. The St. Jerome is like the St. Ignatius at the Cestello. The child, however, is taken straight from Ridolfo Ghirlandajo.\* This establishes certainly what the Coronation has led us to suspect—that in this period Carli was influenced by Ridolfo.†

Of Carli's remaining works there is not much to be said. In the Uffizi there is by him an altar-piece, ascribed to nobody in particular [No. 90] representing the Madonna in glory with Jerome and the Baptist standing, and Francis and Antony Abbot kneeling. It has the look almost of pictures by Lo Spagna. Mr. Earle Drax, at Ashford, has a curious work. It is a "Pietà," with the Magdalen and the Evangelist, Francis and Benedict [Photo. New Gallery, 1894, 226]. The Madonna, the Magdalen and the Evangelist are taken with scarcely a change in type or in action from Garbo's "Pietà" at Munich. The Christ, however, suggests the "Pietà" by Perugino in the Florence Academy. The folds of the draperies, the Francis and the Jerome, leave no doubt that Carli is the author of Mr. Earle Drax's picture.‡ Herr von Kaufmann of Berlin has three half-length figures of saints in tondi. In the public gallery at Montepulciano, there is a tondo of a Madonna in a landscape. The last work by Carli which I have been able to

\* Cf. Nativities at Berlin and Buda-Pesth.

† Still another tondo of late date, a Madonna with two angels, belongs to Mr. E. Richtemberger of Paris. Yet another and better is in the Museo Municipale at Prato [No. 6], Madonna with the infant John. A still better one, an altar-piece, is the highly characteristic Madonna with St. Lawrence and the Evangelist in the Sciarra Collection, recently dispersed.

‡ A similar "Pietà" by Carli belongs to Mr. Drury Lowe of Locko Park. There also, a Baptist by Carli.

discover is an altar-piece which now belongs to the Florentine dealer, Signor Bigazzi. Here we see the Madonna enthroned between SS. Paul and Peter. It is dated 1526—two years later by the way, than the supposed date of Garbo's death. The Madonna still recalls the ones at Siena, and in S. Spirito. The Child resembles the one at Dresden. The saints are like many in earlier pictures. To the last Carli seems to have remained Umbrian.\*

As our studies have not yet reached the ideal position of disregarding, in the artist, all but his artistic personality, I feel constrained to add that, in the flesh, Garbo and Capponi were the same person. That one of the two Raffaelles, both sons of Bartolommeos, was surnamed del Garbo we know from the "Libro Rosso," an account book of the "Compagnia di San Luca" in the Florentine Archives; in which book, under the date of October 17, 1503, we find inscribed a "Raffaelle di Bartolommeo del Gharbo." But as Carli also had a Bartolommeo for father, we must seek further to discover which was Garbo. Carli, however, had for grandfather a Giovanni, and we infer that the other Raffaelle was the grandson of a Nicolas. This results from an entry of November 15, 1499, in the books of the "Matricola dell' Arte de' Medici e Speciali," which reads thus: "Raphael Bartholomei Nicolai Capponi pictor nel Garbo." We learn from this item more even than we had hoped for—that Raffaelle, son of Bartolommeo, son of Nicolas, was surnamed Capponi. This would seem to settle, as it certainly must, that the family name of Garbo was Capponi, and that Capponi and Garbo thus were the same person. But Milanese was led by a wrong inference to divide them up again, because he knew that Carli had his shop in the Piazza S. Apollinare under the Badia, in a region which he, Milanese, supposed to be called "Garbo." "The Via del Garbo, however"—I am quoting Mr. Herbert Horne, who has cleared up the whole question, and most obligingly communicated to me what follows—"was that part of the present Via Condotta which lies between the Via Calzajoli and the Via de' Cerchi; while the Piazza di Sant' Apollinare formed the northern portion of the present Piazza San Firenze. Milanese is therefore mistaken in confusing these two localities. According to the 'Matricola' of the Arte di Medici e Speciali Raphael Bartolomei Nicolai Capponi had his shop in the Garbo; while Raffaelle di Bartolommeo di Giovanni [di Carli] had his shop in the Piazza di Sant' Apollinare."

"If Carli was thus distinct from Capponi, who, on the other hand, was identical with Garbo, how do you account for it," the reader may ask, "that you ascribe

\* Frescoes painted by Carli are not so common. A fair example from his later years is one of SS. Sigismund and Albert, on the right wall as you enter, in S. Donnino, at Brozzi. This, if memory do not fail me, is dated 1522. A panel in the Dominican Church at S. Miniato al Tedesco, dated 1507, and representing the Madonna enthroned between St. Andrew and the Baptist, is closely related to Carli, although scarcely by him. Since the above was written, I have become acquainted with another and most singular work by Carli. It is a large rectangular canvas in the shape of a *cassone*-front, belonging to the Duca di Brindisi at Florence. It is nothing less surprising than a copy, on a vast scale, and with certain variations, of Mantegna's famous engraving representing the Combat of Marine Deities. A background has been added, a sea-port on the right, out of the midst of which rises Brunellesco's dome. On their shields the combatants have painted the arms of the Antinori and of another family. Carli reveals himself in every touch, but chiefly in the types and in the colouring, in both instances a cross between Filippino and Perugino.

Capponi-Garbo's one signed work to Carli?" The student is well aware, however, that neither Cavalcaselle, nor Milanese, nor Morelli—critics each of different stamp—had thought of attributing the picture formerly at S. Maria Nuova, signed Capponi, to Garbo. I affirm that, if internal evidence has any value whatever, this picture must have been painted by Carli. The explanation is probably simple. Carli must have painted this altar-piece for Garbo, who had it inscribed with his own name. This was a proceeding not uncommon among Italian artists, as students know well. I need but cite the many pictures inscribed "Joannes Bellinus," which Bellini did not as much as touch, nor even trouble to have done after his cartoons.

Admitting that Carli painted a picture which Garbo passed off as his own, it follows that they must have been on intimate terms; and we shall understand more readily how the art of the one continued that of the other. Indeed it is by no means improbable that other pictures in which we recognise no hand but Carli's were painted in Garbo's shop, and passed therefore from the start as Garbo's.

#### IV

My excuse for having treated the Raffaellino question at such length here is that, as I have already said, a large number of drawings are universally ascribed to Garbo, of which very few, as we shall see, are actually by him. As the greater number are by Carli, it became necessary to distinguish carefully between their artistic personalities before we could decide to which of them a given drawing should be attributed. This we now shall be able to do with relative despatch. True, among these drawings a number are neither by Garbo nor by Carli, but by an altogether distinct craftsman. Unfortunately he also will have to be discussed, but we can leave him until we have done altogether with Garbo and Carli.

Considering how rare are the paintings by Raffaellino del Garbo which have come down to us, we shall scarcely be surprised that his drawings are even rarer. In fact there are three only of whose authenticity there can be no doubt.

The most important is the well-known sheet in the British Museum, once Vasari's, containing an elaborate sketch for the Resurrected Christ in the Florence Academy picture, and two studies of hands. Compared with the finished work the sketch is amazingly fresh, genial and free from mannerism. It is like Garbo's best and earliest work, and suggests the question whether it was not drawn many years before the execution of the picture for which it ultimately served. Instead of the silly figure in the painting, which neither stands nor floats but seems to dangle like a doll, we have here an ivy-crowned youth, more an Antinous or Bacchus than a Christ, but the more charming for that, of a pose and attitude which explain themselves [Plate lx.].

In handling, the drawing is by no means inferior to its illustrative value. The



silver-point is heightened with white in a way pictorially most effective. The contours have the daintiness that we found in Raffaellino's tondi, and the line is far from lifeless. The stroke is firm, scarcely inferior to Filippino's, but the cross-hatching is somewhat mincing.

The hands in this sheet are a perfect guarantee for a sheet in the Albertina, containing nothing but a study of hands. The execution is quite the same, perhaps a trifle more mincing, and the forms are identical, the fingers bony and tapering, the thumb firm, and the nails square and carefully outlined. This last item is not without its interest, for while it rarely occurs in Filippino, it is a constant mannerism of Botticelli and his closer followers—between whom and Raffaellino, it will be remembered, I tried to establish a connection.

The third drawing is one in Christ Church Library at Oxford, a study for a tondo representing the Madonna with the Magdalen and St. Catherine, and to judge by the description in Cavalcaselle's "*Storia*" [vii. 152], the painting in question must be the one which used to be in Casa Pucci, at Florence. The arrangement and the type suggest Mr. Benson's picture, and doubtless the two works were of the same date. The quality is scarcely inferior to Filippino's. Note in each figure the excellent modelling of the torso. White here also is used with singular pictorial effect. The hatching, however, is as in the other sketches close and somewhat mincing [Plate lxi.].

These three sketches confirm the impression which Raffaellino's early works make. They are by a charming hand, not powerful but perhaps gifted, one from which delightful things might have been expected.

Several other drawings attributed, all but one, to Filippino or Botticelli, seem to me to be by Garbo. A hasty student might give to him sketches attributed—and after careful consideration I would say well attributed—to Filippino, such as the symbolical Crucifixion in the Uffizi [No. 227], wherein the forms have much superficial resemblance to those in Raffaellino's tondo belonging to Herr Simon, or to the reclining female figure in the Ambrosiana, the draperies of which are so singularly like Garbo's. But after all my efforts to guard against the instinctive desire for innovation, I still find myself believing that several sketches ascribed to Filippino are by Raffaellino. I feel most certain of a female head in bistre, in the Collection of Herr von Beckerath, supposed to be the original drawing for the Madonna in the Uffizi altar-piece. But the correspondence between the two heads is not that intimate one which it should be if they were by the same hand. The drawing is altogether softer, and sweeter. The eyelids are more delicate; the mouth is smaller but with fuller lips. These are characteristics of the pupil and not of the master, and my impression is confirmed by the technique with its very close hatching. I should say, therefore, that the drawing was a copy after Lippi's painting made by Garbo for his own use; and in truth if we compare it with such a head as that of the Madonna in the Munich "*Pietà*" we shall see to what use, in spite of modifications, he put it.

I feel less certain with regard to two other drawings both in the Uffizi. The first is a small sketch for the angel of the Annunciation. In technique and in quality it is not to be distinguished from Filippino's work. And yet I find it difficult to persuade myself that it is by this master. It has a grace and a sweetness which are far more like Garbo's, and the folds are more like his than Lippi's. The other is a drawing in silver-point heightened with white for a nude youthful martyr [No. 1252] which, although ascribed to Botticelli, can only be either by Garbo or his master—by which of them I am unable to decide to my own satisfaction. I incline towards Garbo because of the softness of the forms, the relative feebleness of the drawing, and because of something in the hatching.

In the Uffizi there is yet another drawing ascribed to Botticelli—this time with somewhat better reason—but which seems to me by Garbo [No. 207]. It is done with the pen, silver-point, and slight touches of red chalk, heightened with white, is not in perfect condition, and represents a kneeling angel who holds up the infant John to the Christ Child—a fragment evidently for a Madonna. Now, although there is in the types a certain resemblance to Botticelli, I can scarcely doubt but that this drawing is by Garbo. As we have seen, the latter stood for a time in such relation to the former as to account sufficiently for any likeness. If we look closely however, we shall not fail to note the straight profile of the angel, so characteristic of Raffaellino, his type of child with the large head and thin fluffy hair—compare his various tondi—and, most decisive of all, that close cross hatching which never occurs at all in Botticelli, but in Garbo is peculiar enough to distinguish him even from Filippino. Indeed, this sketch stands close to such a painting by Raffaellino as Mrs. Welkers' at West Calder.

But there could scarcely be more complete proof of Raffaellino's intimate relations with Sandro than we may gather from a drawing, representing the Martyrdom of St. Lucy in the Louvre [No. 2009] actually ascribed to Garbo. This attribution surprises me more than a little, because it is by no means one which naturally suggests itself, the obvious one being to Botticelli himself; and it may be due to an old and precious tradition. Certainly there scarcely exists a sketch clearly not by Botticelli himself which is more Botticellian. Yet in every probability it is Garbo's. The contours are his, the hands, particularly of the youth in the foreground goading the ox, are intimately his. Characteristic of him also is the careful outlining of the square nails, and scarcely less so are the profile and bust of Lucy. Yet Lucy's own hands and draperies remind me, in a way however which may be merely accidental, of another painter, of a person I shall call Alunno di Domenico, concerning whom I shall have something to say before the end of this chapter [Plate lxii].

## V

And now we can turn to the drawings, the bulk of them ascribed to Garbo, which I believe to be by Carli. Unfortunately but one, and one only, of these served for a work still existing. This one, as Morelli was the first to recognise, is a nearly life-size study for the head of Lawrence in the S. Spirito altar-piece of 1505. In the Uffizi the sketch [No. 306] passes as Ghirlandajo's, and Morelli ascribed it with the picture for which it served, to Garbo. On this petty error of a great critic we need not dwell, but the Uffizi attribution is not without interest. It will be remembered that at the beginning of the section on Carli I attempted to establish that this painter was on the whole the creature of Domenico Ghirlandajo. Now it is well known that in nothing else does an artist remain so attached to first habits, and that in nothing else therefore will he so clearly betray his origin, as in his manner of drawing. The sketch for the head of St. Lawrence, although presumably not earlier than 1505, when Carli was most thoroughly Peruginesque in his painting, is nevertheless, as drawing, so much in the spirit and manner of Ghirlandajo that, but for Morelli, it always has passed unquestioned as his. When you fix your attention upon it, you will see that it is not so well modelled nor so vital as Domenico would have made it, yet it approaches his manner and quality closely. In the actual painting Carli's habits of the brush got the better of him, and he spilled most of the modest merits of the sketch before he had safely landed it on the panel, for in the picture the head has grown cramped and tight, and the mouth as mincing as in Eusebio di S. Giorgio's works.

Whatever shadow of excuse paintings may offer for holding to Capponi and Carli as distinct artistic personalities, entirely disappears before the drawings. You shall hunt in vain among the sketches which I shall ascribe to Carli, because of their correspondence with pictures signed either "Carli" or "Capponi," for any point that could possibly divide them into two distinct groups. The drawings certainly are by the same hand, and this must strongly confirm the scarcely less certain attribution to one and the same artist of all the paintings as well. Most of these drawings, I may add, are in bistre and white, of small intrinsic merit, and many of them obviously served as patterns for embroiderers.

It is a question whether one of the best of them, the British Museum sketch for a Madonna appearing to St. Bernard, was or was not designed to serve for an embroidery [Plate lxiii.]. Let me say in the first place that there can be no doubt that this design is by no other than Carli. That is attested by the types—the Madonna, for instance, and the angel behind her are like the figures in the Louvre Coronation—by the draperies, heavy yet flowing, by the action of the angel to the right, which resembles the *putti* in the S. Spirito altar-piece, and even the angel in the much earlier altar-piece at Volterra, and finally by the hand, and



by the ear of St. Bernard exactly as the hand and ear of the same saint in S. Spirito, and by the outlines of the landscape closely resembling those in the same picture. The quaint imp chained to St. Bernard is identical in that panel and in our sketch. If it served for an embroidery only, it has the interest of proving that this, the best and most typical of the designs for such a purpose, all of which Vasari ascribed to Garbo, is really by Carli. But Vasari tells us that at S. Spirito there was a picture by Garbo of a St. Bernard "less excellent" in quality than the "Pietà" once there and now in Munich. Now at S. Spirito there already was at that time a Vision of St. Bernard by Perugino, and it is showing too much contempt for Messer Giorgio to suppose him ignorant enough to ascribe that masterpiece to Garbo. There must therefore have been at S. Spirito in Vasari's time a picture of a St. Bernard which passed as Garbo's, and, as it was inferior to the "Pietà" which really is by Garbo, it is not improbable that, like the two other pictures there ascribed by Vasari to Garbo, it really was by Carli. Here the British Museum drawing might be brought in as proof positive that such a picture really did exist, and that it was clearly by Carli. But I fear we cannot proceed so fast. Vasari, it will be remembered, who carefully mentions all the other pictures by Garbo or Carli at S. Spirito, apparently takes no note of the best of Carli's works ever there, the one of 1505, still in its original situation. This is curious enough to arouse suspicion of its being improbable. And in truth, in speaking of a St. Bernard, laconically, Vasari may really have had in mind this very picture in which the most conspicuous figure is St. Bernard. But our design may, after all, have been originally intended for this work, not for the principal panel, but for its predella, representing the Vision of St. Bernard. In that case, Carli did not use this sketch, but adopted a scheme nearer to Filippino's.

A similar problem arises with regard to two designs in the Uffizi [Nos. 340, 341] both representing a saint in armour with crown, globe of empire and halberd, in all probability therefore Sigismund. Here there seems more likelihood that one or the other of these sketches served for a St. Sigismund which Vasari saw at the Murate. He ascribes it to Garbo, but, if our hypothesis is correct, it must have been by Carli.

A small sketch for a Madonna with the Child blessing [Uffizi No. 345] merits attention not for any peculiar excellence, although it has a certain charm, but as bringing further proof to my hypothesis that this entire group of drawings is by Carli. In this sketch the Madonna has the action of the one at S. Spirito, while in type she exactly resembles the one in the British Museum Vision of St. Bernard. The Child, on the other hand, is almost identical with the one in Carli's tondo at Dresden. Another drawing in the Uffizi [No. 348] for a St. Paul shows us a type identical with the St. Jerome in the same Dresden tondo. But the folds on the right sleeve of this drawing are exactly similar to those in the St. Francis of the altar-piece formerly at S. Maria Nuova, signed "Capponi."

It would be tedious beyond endurance to continue this question further. If I

mentioned other and yet other drawings it would be to convince the lover of problems rather than the lover of art. But to do Carli justice, I must draw special attention to a large sketch in the Uffizi [No. 1129] elaborately and admirably done in water colours, for a Marriage of St. Catherine. It is ascribed to Domenico Ghirlandajo, and this attribution for one who, like myself, sees an intimate connection between the two masters, is not without interest ; but the types, pretty and winning, the forms, and the draperies prove that it was done by Carli, and not long after the S. Salvi (now Louvre) Coronation.

## VI

I have already referred more than once, in the course of this chapter, to the fact that among the drawings ascribed to Raffaellino del Garbo some few are neither by him nor by his namesake Carli. As Morelli, in citing these particular sketches, recommends two of them to students as peculiarly typical of Garbo's style, we must take the matter in earnest, and dedicate to it a little time. Happily it will not be labour altogether lost, for it will reveal to us another artistic personality, a minor star I must confess, but scarcely of lower magnitude in the Florentine constellation than such others as it has been, and yet will be, our business to study.

For convenience I shall name this minor light "Alunno di Domenico," that is to say *disciple of Domenico Ghirlandajo*, and we shall find immediately that there is cause for this appellation.

In the gaudy Adoration of the Magi, painted by Ghirlandajo in 1488 for the Innocenti, there is in the middle distance, on the left, a spirited episode representing the Massacre of the Innocents. For violent stress of panting action we shall scarcely compare it with the fresco of the same subject which Domenico painted—his ablest achievement—at the same time or soon afterwards, in the choir of S. Maria Novella. But the episode makes less sacrifice of clearness, and has the advantage of being far more rhythmical. This rhythm, indeed, and a suppleness as of a myriad-linked chain, which this whirling group possesses, is scarcely what we are accustomed to expect from Ghirlandajo. And looking closer, we note other characteristics of a less static and less prosaic school. As in the movement so also in the light clinging draperies, there is a most unexpected reminder of a rival faction—of Filippo's following, of Botticelli and Amico. A deliberate attempt to imitate Sandro was certainly made by Domenico, and made at the moment when he was painting his best, the frescoes in the Sassetti Chapel at S. Trinità ; but the imitation is confined to the heads and to a search for Botticelli's contours, never for his rhythm and movement. Moreover, while the figures in this episode are, in proportion and structure, certainly Domenico's, the heads are of quite a different type ; the faces have a different oval, longer and more pointed ; the eyes are deep-set ; and the expression is eager to the point of vehemence, far removed from

Ghirlandajo's wonted placidity.\* We must conclude that this episode was not painted by Domenico himself, but by some assistant, already signalled out by the master as possessing peculiar talents for such work. To judge by the structure of the figures, which in small reproduce Ghirlandajo's heroes, painted between 1481 and 1485, in the Palazzo Vecchio, we may assume that their author acquired his training in those years. Whether indeed he already had passed under another master, or got his Botticellian strain later, we must leave for the moment undecided; but he certainly grew to be more rather than less the follower of Sandro.

The predelle to this altar-piece [now Nos. 63, 64, 65, 66, 68, 69, 70 in the gallery of the Innocenti]<sup>†</sup> are somewhat more carelessly executed, but by the same hand. The same types, the same structure, the same draperies appear throughout, with the difference, however, that the draperies here tend more to spread flat on the ground, as in Filippo Lippi's following, or to be more flowing, and that a number of the profiles, sharp and pointed, betray greater affinity with the same school.

At the Colonna Gallery, in Rome, there are two *cassone* panels ascribed recently to David Ghirlandajo<sup>‡</sup> which are by our author, Alunno di Domenico, in a phase identical with that in the Innocenti altar-piece. Not only are the types, the figures and the draperies exactly the same there, in the Massacre of the Innocents, and here, in the Rape of the Sabines, and in the Reconciliation between Romans and Sabines, but there is as much identity in arrangement, and rhythm of movement, as the difference in subject permits. The jagged peaks in the landscape show, however, that Alunno was not unaffected by Piero di Cosimo. In 1488, consequently, Alunno di Domenico reveals himself as a close follower of Ghirlandajo, with strong leanings towards Botticelli, and a liking for Piero di Cosimo's fanciful landscape. He is vivacious, ready, not over much in earnest, a painter, in short, with something of Amico's charm, but as inferior to that artist as Ghirlandajo was to Botticelli. We must now briefly pursue his career further, backward as well as forward, for surely he did not explode into maturity in 1488.

The predelle to Ghirlandajo's altar-piece in the Duomo at Lucca, dating certainly no later, and perhaps a year earlier than 1486,<sup>§</sup> are by Alunno, and show him in a more Ghirlandajesque phase than two or three years later. At the ends of the predella stand in niches SS. Lawrence and Augustine. Between them are five episodes: The Conversion of Paul, the Martyrdom of St. Sebastian, the Entombment, the Martyrdom of St. Clement, and Peter delivered from Prison. These are all more graceful in movement than are Ghirlandajo's own figures, and

\* It may be objected that this particular subject requires vehemence of expression, but we shall see that it occurs everywhere in works by the same hand.

† All photographed by Alinari.

‡ Photographed by Anderson, 3750, 3751.

§ I infer this from the obvious way that this altar-piece fits in between the Narni Coronation of 1486, and the undated, but certainly earlier altar-piece in the Florence Academy [No. 66]. The predelle, by the way, to the Coronation are also by Alunno. They represent St. Francis receiving the Stigmata, Christ erect in His Tomb, and St. Jerome in Penitence. They are very Ghirlandajesque.



more expressive in type; otherwise they are much closer to Domenico than any of Alunno's later paintings, and much more free from any Botticellian strain. In the manner of these predelle, but on a scale in which Alunno apparently could achieve but failure, is a fresco by the central portal inside the façade of S. Frediano at Lucca. It represents the Visitation, which takes place in front of an elaborate background of buildings. Here the St. Joseph is perfectly identical with the Peter in the predella in the Duomo, and other resemblances leave scarcely a doubt but that they were painted at the same time.

Even earlier, no later certainly than 1485, are the predelle to Domenico's altarpiece in the Florence Academy [Nos. 66, 67]. Here we have four scenes from the lives of the Saints represented in the picture, executed with Alunno's light, rapid touch, unmistakably his in all that is essential, yet far closer to Ghirlandajo than I have found him elsewhere. This predella must count for us, therefore, as his earliest existing work, although it already is of a mastery, and of a finish which characterise no mere tyro. We have, however, brought him back to the years when Ghirlandajo was executing the work upon which chiefly Alunno's manner seems to have been fashioned, the frescoes in the Palazzo Vecchio. Before leaving this period, it is well to mention that Mr. Brinsley Marlay has two long *cassone*-fronts with the story of the Trojan War, rather early works of our improviser.

At the Leyland sale, some ten or more years ago, four *cassone* panels, recounting Boccaccio's tale of Nastagio degli Onesti, passed into the hands of M. Aynard of Lyons. He did not keep them, however; one, representing the marriage feast, now belongs to Mr. Vernon Watney of London, and the others to M. Spiridon of Paris. They were painted, it seems, in 1487, to commemorate the marriage of Lucrezia Pucci to Francesco Bini [Cavalcaselle, *Storia*, vi. 249], and have, until quite recently, always been accepted as Botticelli's own work. While it is probable that Sandro undertook the painting of them, and that they left his shop as his own, it nevertheless may be questioned whether he touched any of them, and whether he as much as furnished the cartoons. It is likely that he did no more than sketch out roughly how he desired to have them, and left the rest to pupils and assistants. Thus, Mr. Watney's panel seems to have been left to Sellajo, and a second to our Alunno, while the remaining two may possibly have been painted between them, Sellajo doing, under Botticelli's close supervision, the figures and the foregrounds, Alunno, the horses and the backgrounds. Be this as it may regarding the others, there can be no doubt that Alunno designed and painted the panel representing the disturbance of the feast on the forest shore by the entrance of the spectral cavalier pursuing the naked damsel with his dogs, who already are tearing her. In this painting, if we except the horseman's cloak and the youthful lady sitting under the Pucci arms, there is no greater suggestion of Botticelli than we have already discerned in Alunno's other paintings; and the exception was dictated probably by Sandro himself. Everything else is so unmistakably our painter's, that we need not attempt to demonstrate it. It should

be observed, nevertheless, that this picture, ascribed to Botticelli, is overwhelmingly Ghirlandajesque, most obviously in the background of hills and water and in the rather heavy, largely and loosely modelled male faces. One of them indeed, that of the old man on the extreme left, was neither due to Alunno's fancy nor yet studied from life, but copied, with the least change possible, from the fresco at S. Trinità, representing Pope Honorius approving the rule of St. Francis, painted two years earlier by Ghirlandajo. If you will turn your eyes to the right, in this fresco, you will see a group of three men and a boy. The head next to the Pope is identical with the head in our panel.\*

Alunno, then, did actually work for and with Botticelli, and this fact helps to explain the distinct traces of that great master which we have already found in his pictures, as well as those which we shall find later.

In the collection of Lord Ashburnham, now dispersed, there were two *cassone*-fronts representing the Story of Jason at Colchis, one of which—wherein the chief episode is a feast—is by Alunno di Domenico. The other has been repeatedly attributed to Piero di Cosimo, but it would rather seem to be the product of some Northern painter, then working at Florence in close imitation of Piero. As the latter panel is dated 1487, and as the two continue the same tale, and are, moreover, of exactly the same size, we may safely assume that both were painted at about the same time. Alunno's panel† has every relation to the two in the Colonna Gallery. The same types, the same structure, the same vehemence of expression, the same blond colouring, and the same landscape betraying the influence of Piero di Cosimo. We see Alunno in a similar phase in the delightful *cassone*-front belonging to the Honourable Mrs. Baillie-Hamilton at Langton, Duns, Scotland, representing in many episodes the Story of Io.‡ But for a while Piero's influence was strong upon our impressionable painter, and to this there are three other *cassone*-fronts to bear witness. Two of them, belonging to Mrs. Austen at Horsmonden, represent the Marriage of Perithous and Hippodamia, and the Fight between the Centaurs and Lapithae;§ the remaining one, belonging to the Marquess of Bath, at Longleat (ascribed to Pintoricchio), represents a Feast and a Flight. All three have the intimate characteristics of Alunno, but the darker colouring, and the more fanciful landscape betray Piero's influence. They may safely be dated at about 1490. Very characteristic also are two further *cassone*-fronts with the Story of Joseph, belonging to Mr. Brinsley Marlay. They are

\* The man and the boy are Francesco Sassetti and his son. The next figure is Lorenzo the Magnificent. May not the fourth portrait, seeing it recurs in our panel, be a Pucci?

† Photo. New Gallery, 1894 [No. 117], officially ascribed to Benozzo.

‡ Attributed to Pintoricchio.

§ New Gallery, 1894 [Nos. 91, 97], ascribed to Signorelli—thus a certain recognition of Piero di Cosimo's influence. To Dr. Richter they seemed by Matteo Balducci ("Repertorium" xviii. p. 240). As this was going through the press, I saw in the Louvre a gift just made by M. de Vandeul of two *cassone*-fronts representing the Birth of Venus and the Marriage of Peleus and Thetis. Ascribed to Credi, they are charming and very characteristic works of Alunno, painted, I should think, just before the panel belonging to M. Spiridon. Here Alunno reveals himself as a highly gifted story-teller, destined to become one of the few most remarkable book-illustrators of Italy.

reproduced as Plates 51, 52 in the catalogue of Artaud de Montor's Collection, and are still attributed to Pesellino.

After this date, Alunno's career as a painter is not to be pursued for long. He seems to have turned sharply towards Botticelli and Filippino, as is witnessed by a work wherein, while retaining his essential characteristics, he makes ample show of indebtedness to Sandro. The work in question consists of two pilasters [Florence Academy 268, 269, no attribution], upon which are painted an Annunciation, two medallions of Prophets, and full-length figures of SS. Dominic and Thomas Aquinas. Botticelli's influence is also distinctly discernible in the more Ghirlandajesque tondo, representing the Adoration of the Magi, in the Panciatichi Collection at Florence [No. 90].\* But from about 1490, for a decade and more, Alunno's energies must have been expended for the most part on furnishing illustrations for books. Yet before approaching this topic, we must consider three or four pictures, with figures on a larger scale, which, I believe, can safely be ascribed to Alunno. The best of these is a Deposition from the Cross belonging to the Marchese Mannelli Riccardi, of Florence. It is a work not altogether unworthy of the name it bears, although it is as clearly Alunno's as it is not Ghirlandajo's. The twelve figures, of about half the size of life, are far from unpleasant. One or two of them, such as the Evangelist, and the Donor, approach Domenico in his best, his S. Trinità phase. The colour is golden like Filippino's finest. The landscape is almost charming. The predominant influence here is Ghirlandajo's, yet the kneeling Jerome is Filippinesque. It will scarcely be necessary to demonstrate that this canvas is Alunno's, the types, the draperies and the landscape being so obviously his. Moreover the composition is, in essentials, identical with one of the Innocenti predelle, and like that, has a singular feature, an arrangement of the dead Christ, which recalls no other Florentine, but the Umbrian Signorelli.

The St. Jerome in the last picture enables us to ascribe to Alunno two other figures of the same Church Father, the one with assurance, the other with some diffidence. The first belongs to the Baron Chiaramonte Bordonaro of Palermo [Photo. Alinari], and is a distinctly pleasant work. It is close enough to Filippino to be ascribed to him, but the landscape, the draperies, the treatment of the beard, and the resemblance to the same saint in the Deposition, leave no doubt in my mind that its author was Alunno. The other St. Jerome is the one in the Florence Academy [No. 54], ascribed to Fra Filippo. With this painter, it has nothing in common, but with his son's style, more than a little: the head, for instance, is

\* For completeness, I add a few more of Alunno's paintings. In the Florence Academy [Nos. 278, 279, 280], uniform predelle, St. Jerome, St. Francis, the Entombment—almost identical with those in the Innocenti. In the Uffizi [No. 1208] St. Benedict and the Monks who attempt to poison him, and from the S. Maria Nuova Gallery, a companion-picture representing Maurus saving Placidus from drowning, as well as the Four Evangelists, painted above a triptych ascribed to Spinello Aretino. In the illustrated catalogue of the Artaud de Montor collection [Paris 1843], there seems to be a number of reproductions of paintings by Alunno. Thus, besides Plates 51 and 52, two *cassone*-fronts with the Story of Joseph (already mentioned as now in the possession of Mr. Brinsley Marlay), there are Plate 59, a Crucifixion, and Plate 16, containing Five Prophets.



thoroughly Filippinesque. But for the attempt at muscular modelling and for the opaque greyish colouring, I should not hesitate to ascribe this panel also to Alunno. I doubt, however, whether hesitation for these reasons is justifiable. The same modelling occurs in the small St. Jerome in the same gallery [No. 278], and the same colouring characterises most of Alunno's other paintings in the same collection. From the waist down, this figure is identical with the Jerome in the Deposition. The lion is like the beast in the small St. Jerome. The landscape is but a variation on the Palermo picture. Finally, the small figures in the background are as good as a signature, bearing so clearly as they do, Alunno's stamp.

But our little master was scarcely at his best when painting large figures. He is barely tolerable in a tondo at the Uffizi [No. 85], containing the Madonna and the Infant John adoring the Christ Child; and he sinks below the threshold, in a figure of the size of life, and without entertaining accessories. This is a Justice in the Cenacolo di S. Apollonia, ascribed to the School of Pollajuolo, although the head is sufficiently characteristic of Alunno to justify the attribution to him of the entire panel.

A venture like this last, and even the other larger essays, demonstrate that Alunno di Domenico did well to confine himself chiefly to small figures, and to turn finally to Illustration.

This minor painter, who apparently was incapable of producing on the scale of life a figure that can support inspection, who is feeble if vivacious, and scarcely more than pleasant in predelle and *cassone*-fronts, was a book-illustrator charming as few in vision and interpretation, with scarcely a rival for daintiness and refinement of arrangement, spacing, and distribution of black and white. In Florence between 1490 and 1500 few apparently, if any, illustrated books were published without wood-cuts, for which Alunno di Domenico did not furnish the designs. The student who has mastered his manner as revealed in the paintings which I have indicated, and in the drawings of which I shall speak presently, will not fail to recognise Alunno's touch and style in nine-tenths at least of the reproductions in Dr. Kristeller's "Early Florentine Woodcuts"\* or in M. Gustave Gruyer's "Les Illustrations des Ecrits de Jérôme Savonarole."† Unfortunately I have not the space to demonstrate my statement point by point. It scarcely needs it. I shall content myself with indicating in the books of Dr. Kristeller, and of M. Gruyer, those cuts wherein Alunno's hand may be most readily discerned. As obvious examples as one can ask for are St. Antonino in his Cell (Gr. 167, Kr. 18, Ghirlandajesque), Landino Lecturing (Botticellian, Gr. 173, Kr. 19), Confession from S. Antonino's "Somma," dated 1507 (Gr. 93, Kr. 108), Lorenzo di Medici's Compagnia del Mantelaccio (Kr. 18), Savonarola and the Astrologer (Gr. 142), Benevieni defending Savonarola (Gr. 125), Savonarola exhorting Nuns (Gr. 152), The Mass (Gr. 91, Kr. 109), Death-Bed Scene (Gr. 75), Lamento del Duca Galeazzo (the action whereof should be

\* London, Kegan Paul, Trench & Co., 1897.

† Paris, Firmin-Didot et Cie, 1879.

compared with that in the Massacre of the Innocents in the Innocenti altar-piece) (Kr. 63), Storia di Uberto e Filomena (Kr. 13), Gaultieri e Griselda (Kr. 39), Novella di Due Preti (Kr. 70), Storia di Ippolito Buondelmonti (Kr. 25), Lorenzo's Nencia di Barberino (Kr. 26), the Triumph of Death (Gr. 63, Kr. 17). Alunno furnished designs for wood-cuts for the Sacre Rappresentazioni so popular toward the turn of the century in *piagnone* Florence. The following are among the most characteristic: S. Margherita (Kr. 36), Judgment of Solomon (Kr. 38), S. Agata (Kr. 29), S. Orsola (Kr. 30), S. Felicità (Kr. 43), Augustus and the Sibyl (Kr. 44), S. Rosana (Kr. 46), Annunciation (Kr. 53), S. Eufrosina (peculiarly characteristic) (Kr. 58). By Alunno di Domenico also are all the illustrations to Pulci's Morgante Maggiore dated 1500, to Ænea Silvio's Storia di Due Amanti and to the Epistole e Evangelii\* dated 1495. In the last book, the wood-cut representing Peter being led out of Prison is, allowing for difference of material, quite identical with the predella of the same subject at Lucca. With slight change, Alunno uses these two figures in a cut for the Fior di Virtù, dated 1498 (Kr. 7), representing an angel leading a monk.

If, as seems clear, Alunno di Domenico was not only an assistant whom Ghirlandajo was happy to employ to relieve by his vivacity and lightness his own too *bourgeois* gravity; if Alunno, again, was the author of the various *cassone*-fronts which I have described; and, if at the same time it was he and no other who furnished the altogether fascinating designs for nearly all the illustrated books that appeared in Florence for some fifteen years, then surely his was an artistic personality with which we have done well to become acquainted. In his phase as illustrator (in the narrower sense of the word), there has scarcely ever been one more charming. What was the real name and identity of this artistic personality I must, partly because for me this question has small interest, partly because I see no answer, leave to others to determine. Dr. Ulmann, who, stumbling upon a number of Alunno's pictures, recognised that they were by the same hand, would identify Alunno with David Ghirlandajo.† This is one of Dr. Ulmann's unhappy guesses. David worked always with Domenico during the latter's life-time, never showing in his painting a markedly distinct personality of his own, and never apparently thinking of an independent manner. David already was working with his brother in 1475 (in the Vatican Library), whereas we scarcely can trace Alunno's career further back than 1485. Alunno drew away from Ghirlandajo and became more and more Botticellian. Surely this is not likely to have happened to one who, like David, had, as a painter, always worked faithfully and with perfect subordination as Domenico's mere assistant. Apprentices' hands can be clearly perceived in Domenico's frescoes at S. Maria Novella, but never a touch betraying the hand of Alunno. He, moreover, seems to have had no liking for life-size figures. So far as we know him at all, it is, with very few exceptions, in

\* Most of all these in Kristeller.

† Jahrbücher der preuss. Kunstsammlungen, xvii. p. 61.

small figures, and this preference would easily have led over to book-illustration. Nor is it likely that Vasari, writing at length of David, would have failed to say a word about his activity as an illustrator, if David and Alunno were the same artistic personality.

## VII

Drawings by Alunno di Domenico are not common. The few which do exist are ascribed, significantly enough, to Ghirlandajo, Alunno's master, or to Filippino Lippi and Raffaellino del Garbo—this, of course, owing to the Botticellian tendency of his later manner. His most Ghirlandajesque drawing, and therefore his earliest, is one in Munich of two men in conversation. I confess this sketch is at first glance scarcely to be distinguished from Domenico's. Looking closer, however, we are obliged to note not only an inferiority of quality, but an expression of the eyes, a manner of pose, and a crumpling of the draperies which make it probable that it is by Alunno, rather than by any other of Ghirlandajo's pupils. There can be no doubt whatever about another early drawing, a sketch in the Uffizi [No. 123 F, corn. 62] for the predella at Lucca, representing the Deliverance of Peter. Although ascribed to Domenico, it is obviously not from his hand, and the vivacity of the action and the various mannerisms suggest Alunno clearly enough. As we have seen, this motive was used by him on two separate occasions for woodcuts. To a somewhat later period belongs another Uffizi drawing ascribed to Ghirlandajo [No. 358]. Here the types and attitudes closely resemble the figures in the Innocenti predelle, and the eyes and draperies are distinctly his. Several more drawings from Alunno's Ghirlandajesque phase will be noticed in the catalogue.

To the beginning of his later manner belongs a drawing in the Uffizi ascribed to the school of Filippino [No. 329, corn. 79]. We see two youths draped, tall and slender, with Alunno's unmistakable features, and draperies. They recall figures in the Panciatichi tondo. The remaining sketches with hardly an exception are ascribed to Garbo. Whosoever was responsible for this attribution, had assimilated Alunno's sketches to those that we believe to be by Carli; and we need scarcely be surprised, for Carli must have also been a pupil of Ghirlandajo, and sometimes imitator of various Botticellians and even of Alunno himself. Thus, his Uffizi drawing of St. Paul—to cite but one obvious instance—is closely related to Alunno's St. Andreas in the large Deposition, or to Alunno's sketch in Dresden for a St. Sigismund, which Morelli attributed, as indeed he attributed all the others which we shall now mention, to Garbo.\* (Here there is less excuse, as the folds are so obviously in the manner of Ghirlandajo.) The small sharp features, and the setting of the eyes are distinctly Alunno's. Among the Uffizi drawings ascribed to Garbo, the earliest and by far the most obviously Alunno's is a design [No. 339]

\* *Galerien Borghese & Doria*, p. 147, *Kunstchronik* 1892-93, pp. 88, 89.



for the back of a cope, of four figures, pilgrims perhaps, in prayer. Here there is nothing which does not betray Alunno, from the shaggy hair, and deep-set eyes, and sharp features, to the draperies, and the tailor-like drawing of such of the garments as are close fitting. Further advanced in the Botticellian manner, and therefore more like Garbo, and closer in style to his own illustrations, are five other sketches, probably for embroideries, forming, I believe, a series with the miracles and funeral of a saint—Zanobi, perhaps. The most characteristic is the sketch for the funeral [No. 1118], where all the figures have the sharp features, the bright eyes, and the matted hair that characterise Alunno's later manner. The close fitting garments have again the tailor-like neatness noted in the last drawing, and occurring frequently in the illustrations. The looser draperies are, as we should expect, Ghirlandajesque, but simplified, and drawn out longer. Even the grouping is Ghirlandajesque, and very peculiar to Alunno is the tilting back of the figures. Only less characteristic is the sketch [No. 350] where a bishop blesses with his crozier two youths, one kneeling, the other seated on the floor. Note the features, and the hair of all the figures, and the cast of the bishop's mantle. Another sketch [No. 351, Plate lxiv.] shows us the same youths in the presence of a third, evidently of better condition, cooking a fish. A companion to this is a drawing [No. 352] wherein we see a bishop chasing away a demon. A sketch at Genoa also belongs to this series.

In his drawings Alunno scarcely appears as a great draughtsman, but although somewhat tame and timid in touch, he is not lacking in the charm wherein his book-illustrations abound. The sketches last mentioned, all for embroidery, would tend to establish the supposition that in mid-career, or earlier, he turned away from painting to devote himself to the smaller arts, and the superiority of his illustrations to his pictures proves that his choice was justified. How many talents are lost because their possessors, rather than turn them to the utmost account, will force them to tasks ambitious beyond their reach!

## CHAPTER VI

### THE GHIRLANDAJO, GRANACCI, AND PIERO DI COSIMO

**I**N the last two chapters we have been pursuing the succession of Fra Filippo. Great as were its qualities, and great its achievements, this school was nevertheless destined to a decay so complete that it could not so much as fertilise fresher soil. And no wonder! The tradition of art which culminated in Sandro Botticelli was one characterised chiefly by charm of expression and grace of line. In essentials it was, therefore, but the Gothic tradition of the fourteenth century, living on, thanks to two men of genius, through the fifteenth. Thanks to them also, it attained to types of the beautiful as little dreamt of by the Giotteschi, as an equal advance, within its own kind, beyond Sandro's ideal can be imagined by us, in our turn. Although as wonderful a product of Florentine genius as any, it was not only, like all highly refined types of art, without thoroughfare, uninviting, therefore, to such as craved to assert themselves by means of forms yet to be perfected, but it also had the misfortune to be out of harmony with the dominant Naturalistic tendencies of the Florentine Quattrocento—with the ardour almost purely scientific, for the discovery of the actual shapes of things, and with the almost nineteenth-century craving for obvious progress. It was the seed of the Naturalists, consequently, which inherited the earth, and as the kings of Judah from the stem of Jesse, so all the Cinquecento painters of Florence were the lineal offspring of Alessio Baldovinetti.

#### I

In this chapter we shall study such of his descendants whose activity lay chiefly in the fifteenth century as we have not yet treated—Pollajuolo and Verrocchio, also Alessio's followers, have already had our attention—chiefly, then, Domenico Ghirlandajo, and Piero di Cosimo.

Of Baldovinetti himself as a draughtsman, except by means of his paintings, we know almost nothing. I have never seen a drawing which was beyond

question his; indeed, I know but few sketches which may be by him, and even these it might not have occurred to me to connect with Alessio but for the suggestion of Hr. Jens Thiis. Originally four of these, each with a small figure, were perhaps on the same sheet, but they now are separated, and in the Uffizi they are catalogued as of the School of Angelico [Nos. 90, 91, 93, and 94, Plate lxv.]. One of them contains the sprightly figure of a lad, another of a somewhat older person seated in profile; and in each of the two remaining ones we see a young man playing, one on a lute, the other on a viol. They offer little hold for demonstrable attribution; but something in the slimmness of the figures, in the alertness of the movement, something in the types and in the forms of the hands, seems to point to Alessio. Not, I should add, the unpalatable Baldovinetti of later years, but the gay, dainty youth of great artistic promise who painted for the Annunziata along with Fra Angelico that panel with the Marriage of Cana, the Baptism, and the Transfiguration, which still passes as Fra Giovanni's\* (Florence Academy, No. 33). It is possible that our sketches were done like these paintings, in connection with the saintly friar—which would explain their common attribution. Be that as it may, the more we compare these sketches with the two serving-lads in the Marriage, the stronger will grow our conviction that they must be by the same hand.

And if these dainty sketches are Alessio's, it follows that two other leaflets containing equally small and equally charming figures are his. One, an angel seated playing on a viol (Uffizi, No. 92), is also ascribed to Angelico, but the other (Uffizi, No. 1095) is given to Masolino. This is a pretty picture of three sprightly adolescent creatures, with the quick buoyant step of youth, who stop one another and turn in their walk toward a young woman, as light and yet dignified as a Victory, who addresses them while she offers a garland. Clearly this is by the same hand that drew the five small figures already mentioned; but in this group it is easier to see that that hand must have been the youthful Alessio's. The alert action, the gestures, the flow of the folds in the draperies, even the awkward perspective of the feet and their shape, can be readily matched in the Academy panel ascribed to Angelico, and in the Annunziata fresco.

It might be possible to eke out this meagre list of Alessio's drawings with three or four copies, but he remains one of the least adequately represented of Florentine draughtsmen.

Very different is the case with Domenico Ghirlandajo. From his hand we have a large number of drawings, in various materials; and, as a fair proportion of them is for paintings which still exist, we are not at a loss for foundations whereupon to base a comparison between his talents as a painter and as a draughtsman.

Unfortunately, I am not acquainted with a single preparatory study for those

\* An account of this panel will be found in the "Gazette des Beaux Arts" for July 1898. Reprinted in the second series of my "Study and Criticism of Italian Art."



of Ghirlandajo's works wherein he is by far at his best, the frescoes at S. Gimignano, the one in the Sistine Chapel, and—his highest reach—the series in S. Trinità at Florence. For the altar-piece, however, which once accompanied the last-named frescoes, the Nativity now in the Academy [No. 195, dated, it will be remembered, 1485], a drawing perhaps does exist, not for the entire composition, to be sure, but for the drapery of the kneeling Madonna. The sketch in question (in Berlin), is in pen and ink on white paper, and differs somewhat from the painting. The hands are crossed, the legs are not in the same position, and the figure faces in the opposite direction. The quality is relatively excellent, the folds being decidedly more intelligible and functional than in the painting. The pen-stroke and the hatching are neat and pleasant, but not so far above Perugino, who uses a similar technique, as it is below Ghirlandajo's pupil and, as pen-draughtsman, faithful follower, Michelangelo. The superficial relation of this sketch to the beautiful study for drapery of Verrocchio's school, in the British Museum, will not escape notice.

For Ghirlandajo's most ambitious, certainly most famous, but least successful, large venture, for the series of frescoes in S. Maria Novella, we possess a number of preparatory sketches. The artistic failure of these paintings could not have been due to Ghirlandajo's increasing mediocrity alone, but to two other causes as well: on the one hand, the eagerness of his employers to immortalise relatives and friends of both sexes, in all the ludicrous pompousness of people trying to adopt a grandeur of carriage to which they have not been reared; and on his own part, his large reliance upon his assistants for the execution of the work. We shall not be surprised, therefore, to discover striking differences of artistic quality between the finished work and the preparatory drawings.

The most spontaneous of all is a rapid, summary indication for the chief episode in the fresco representing the Visitation. It is a large drawing in pen and ink on white paper [Uffizi, No. 291], the sort of thing which an artist well broken in to a tradition, and master of his hand, can execute in a few minutes; and, although almost certainly a first thought, and indicated, for the most part, with mere scrawls, these scrawls are, as they should be, full of significance, and in all that is essential to the conception, the fresco is wholly implied in the sketch. The buildings are outlined with a ruler, but the figures with splendid freedom of stroke. All his tricks of shorthand are here, the circles for the eyes, the angular tips for the noses, and those legs tapering down to nothing which Michelangelo also, to the very end of his career, affected in his rapid sketches.

Also a first thought, no doubt, is the Uffizi drawing [No. 292] for the Sposalizio; but while scarcely less dashing, it is yet more elaborated. True, it contains the odious episode of the disappointed suitors beating Joseph on the back—and this action was one Ghirlandajo was so anxious to get right that the same sheet contains three separate studies for it—but the group of life-diminishing women to the left is happily wanting, and the Virgin holds herself proudly like the legitimist princess that she was, and not as the heavy-faced female whom

David or some equally stolid assistant put into the fresco. The proud carriage of the Virgin was, however, but a happy first thought, and, as if instantaneously routed by his own creation, he sketched in to her right a lowlier, more broken type of female, which finally won her way into the painting. As mannerisms we note here again the goggle eyes, and the effective short nibs wherewith the nose, the mouth, and the under-lip are rendered.

The most detailed and yet the most interesting of all the studies for this series is still another pen-sketch (in the Albertina) representing the apparition of the angel to Zachariah in the temple. The fresco, as we remember, was painted to be a sort of National Portrait Gallery of celebrated Florentine contemporaries, and this intention is already manifested in the design. But happily we have as yet none of that crowding of wooden heads which disfigures the finished work, but beautifully penned faces and figures, filling, but not confusing the space. And talking of space—in actuality how little, but in effect how great is the difference between the design and the painting! In the latter you can scarcely breathe, in the other it is at least pleasant. I cannot conceive why, besides over-crowding his scene with portraits, this doubtless at his employer's behest, Domenico, by lowering the height of his arches, to make room apparently for a voluminous inscription, by removing the charming house on the left to replace it with a lumbering two-storeyed bas-relief, in its architectural relation quite unintelligible, and by bringing nearer the building in the rear, deliberately did nearly all he could to dribble away the much needed space, so admirably indicated in the sketch. Then again, in the sketch, under the arch to the right, we have a group of charming women, one holding up her dress with a splendid grace. In the fresco all this has given place to stolid prettiness. The execution of this pen-study is as characteristic, and as delightful, with perhaps one exception, as any which Ghirlandajo ever did. None of his stenographic and calligraphic tricks are wanting, but they are used with perfect decision and much grace.

For another of the frescoes, one of the most happy because of its spaciousness and arrangement, and not because of its execution, which was mostly left to assistants, for Zachariah naming the infant John, there is in the Malcolm Collection a study for the entire composition. But as we already are well acquainted with this style of drawing, we take greater interest in a study at the Uffizi [No. 297] for the two figures standing by themselves on the right of the same fresco. The figures are on a much larger scale than is usual with Domenico, and we can observe his intention all the better. Here it is to hang the draperies properly, and to make them as functional as he could. His skill is not great, despite his obvious acquaintance with Masaccio's unrivalled use of folds; yet as compared with the finished work, where even this sketch is misunderstood, it ranks as serious and great art. Its chief interest perhaps is its method of hatching, and its pen-stroke, in both amazingly like the earlier studies of Michelangelo, who, particularly in his draperies, reveals so clearly what elsewhere he would seem (as scarcely could have been the case) to conceal deliberately—his pupilship under Ghirlandajo.

The most vivacious, and perhaps most delightful, of all Domenico's drawings is the sketch at the British Museum, for the Birth of the Virgin in the same series [Plate lxvi.]. It is done with rapid, telling strokes of the pen—no time lost—and a rhythmical well-articulated composition it promised to be, stately without stiffness, well filled yet perspicuous. But room had to be made for no less than five enormous, rigid, staring, awkward Florentine matrons, and the disruption of the fine pyramidal group busy about the infant followed of necessity. Other sketches had to be drawn for the fresco as we now see it. I know of none for the whole of the re-arranged composition, but am acquainted with four studies for details. One for the headless figure of the youngest, shortest, and most wooden Florentine dame (at Chatsworth) has no striking interest, and another for the serving-maid pouring out the water [Uffizi, No. 289], although much better, calls for no special comment. The two remaining studies are of heads, one at Chatsworth for the matron on the extreme left, and another at Windsor for—if I mistake not—the old woman standing beside her [Plate lxvii.]. As Domenico has achieved his highest in single heads—in the fresco, by the way, these particular ones will not rank with the best—we can scarcely fail to be curious about his less laboured attempts at the same problem. Both those which we are now considering are as masterly as, in his paintings, his finest heads seldom are. The one at Chatsworth is simpler in handling, black chalk used almost as a pen and finely hatched, but is perhaps more direct and vigorous in conception, frank and large. The head at Windsor in silver-point, elaborately heightened with white, loses somewhat in spontaneity for what it gains in pictorial quality. The latter might, by a tyro, be mistaken for a *Credi*, while the former is in some respects more worthy of Michelangelo. In the finished fresco, however, both these heads have lost so much of their virtue that one might conceivably entertain a doubt as to their identity.

As we have no more sketches\* of special value for the paintings at S. Maria Novella, before speaking of the one or two remaining leaflets which can be attached to works still existing, we may as well note, among Ghirlandajo's drawings, the other studies for heads.

The earliest in date, and at least as fine as any, is in the British Museum, a profile of an elderly, smooth-faced man, which years ago, when I first recognised it as Ghirlandajo's, was catalogued vaguely as Florentine [Plate lxviii.]. Yet it is most distinctively Domenico's, not however of his more mechanical, later years, but of his youthful period, of the time when he was painting his frescoes at S. Gimignano; and one should compare this profile with the portraits there, particularly those on the right in the Funeral of S. Fina. But our drawing is of finer quality, both as interpretation and as execution than any even of these.

\* In the Malcolm Collection there is, however, a splendid pen-sketch for the stiff great lady staring out at us from the Birth of the Baptist. In the drawing she is in profile, and this has given rise to the opinion that it is a study for the Giovanna Tornabuoni in the Visitation.



The character of the person could scarcely be individualised more convincingly, and as construction, as modelling, we shall seldom, if ever again, find Domenico approaching so closely to Masaccio. The attribution to Ghirlandajo might of course not occur to one, but once made, must, to the competent student, seem obvious, and I will not attempt to demonstrate it. It would be an instance of telling the clock by algebra.

The remaining heads, all portraits of course, are nearer in date to the frescoes at S. Trinità and at S. Maria Novella, particularly to the latter. The most splendid of them is an almost life-size study of a smooth-cheeked, full-faced, but wide-eyed, and thoughtful man under thirty.\* The modelling could scarcely be more robust, and the drawing of the hair is finely decorative. The whole produces a pictorial effect, and one also of such freedom in handling, as we shall scarcely find paralleled in Ghirlandajo's painted portraits. Among these the nearest to our drawing, although inferior, is the so-called "Portrait of Verrocchio" in the Uffizi [No. 1163], still ascribed, as is this design, to Credi, but Ghirlandajo's nevertheless. Singularly like the Louvre head both in style and character, although of weaker quality, is the bust in the British Museum, of a lady more fashionable than prepossessing. Much more powerful in conception, and finer, larger, in handling is the splendid head of an old woman at Chantilly, probably of earlier date.† Only less vigorous is another bust much later in point of date, of a fashionable lady, this time of more attractive expression if not appearance, in the Uffizi [No. 298]. All these have been done in nearly the same materials, and are characterised by an almost identical treatment. In the British Museum there is the life-size bust of a youngish man scarcely to be distinguished from a woman, done this time, however, in Ghirlandajo's pen technique, and that not of the most vigorous. It is a head not lacking, at all events, in charm, and its features have a certain resemblance to those of the great lady in the Birth of John.‡

Soon after finishing his task at S. Maria Novella, Ghirlandajo in 1491 designed his Visitation (now in the Louvre) which, despite the fact that the execution is largely Mainardi's, is one of his pleasantest works. For the drapery of the Virgin there is in the Uffizi an elaborate study [No. 315], this time not as the sketches for drapery already noted, in pen and ink, but washed, and heightened with white, so as to produce an effect of great plasticity [Plate lxix.]. Although in the arrangement of the folds we can discern the influence of Verrocchio, the large sweep of the lines bears witness to even closer acquaintance with Masaccio. Of the best artistic quality are the contours which both drape and model the back—a point wherein the painting has fallen far short of the drawing. The only other sketch for an extant work, is the pen-drawing in the Albertina for the altar-piece of 1492,

\* Louvre, Salle des Boîtes, where it still passes as Credi's. The attribution to Ghirlandajo is due to Morelli.

† There ascribed also to Credi, but if the general character does not suffice to prove that it is Ghirlandajo's—compare her with the old women at S. Gimignano and at Florence in the Vespucci fresco at Ognissanti—then look at the handling, the folds of the hood, and the drawing of the mouth.

‡ S. Maria Novella.

in the Palazzo dei Priori at Volterra. The quality of the sketch is only less poor than that of the painting. The final arrangement adopted for the latter certainly is much better than in the sketch, but in consequence the two female saints have lost all their grace and attractiveness.

The designs by Ghirlandajo for paintings which no longer exist, although in every way as good as the others, require, with one exception, no special mention, for they have nothing new to tell us. The one exception, however, is, I can scarcely hesitate to say, the masterpiece of Domenico's draughtsmanship. It is a pen-sketch at Munich, representing, within the choir of a Roman basilica,\* the baptism of a man [Plate lxx.]. Among his extant paintings there is none which approaches this design in beauty of arrangement and grouping, and in none of his drawings do we find abler pen work, greater decision, or a pleasanter touch.

## II

As most of Domenico Ghirlandajo's assistants seem to have been little more gifted than house-painters, it is not surprising that they have left few drawings worthy of note except from an archæological point of view. The best of these aids was Mainardi, and quite conceivably several sheets of a feebler kind, usually ascribed to Domenico, are by him.

In one case, at least, we seem fairly justified in attributing to him a drawing which always has passed for Ghirlandajo's. This is a study of two children's heads, in silver-point heightened with white, pictorial and charming, yet not on a level with any of Ghirlandajo's authentic sketches. The sheet I refer to is in the Uffizi [No. 288, Plate lxxi.], where it has apparently roused no question, not even on Morelli's part. Perhaps the inferiority in quality might escape the attention of one who was not making such a comprehensive study of a draughtsman's entire remains as it is my pleasant task to be doing now, but it surprises me somewhat that no one should have observed that these heads are for the two angels on the right in the famous tondo by Mainardi in the Louvre [No. 1367]. They have undergone some slight change in the painting, and lost more than a little of their freshness, but, considering how much of his drawing a Florentine was apt to spill before he safely landed it in colours on the panel, we shall not wonder.†

A follower much feebler than Mainardi reveals himself in a sketch for a draped figure, belonging to Mr. G. T. Clough of London. This happens to have an interest because it is in all probability a study for the most prominent person in the fresco representing *The Visiting of Prisoners*, one of the frescoes in the chapel of the *Buonuomini di S. Martino*. As students are aware, Cavalcaselle,

\* Is it possible that it represents Pope Sylvester baptizing Constantine, and that it was a sketch for one of the frescoes in the Vatican Library at which Domenico and David were at work in 1475?

† The other sketches which I venture to assign to this painter will be found in the catalogue.

having found these paintings attributed to Filippino Lippi, despite his seeing that they were far closer to Ghirlandajo, forced himself, as was too frequently his wont in similar cases, into fancying that they were much more markedly Filippinesque than they really were, and concluded therefore that they might be by Raffaellino del Garbo. They are nothing of the sort, but the product of a very close imitator of Ghirlandajo. Dr. Ulmann, who recognised this affinity, would place their execution early, towards 1475.\* In this he was mistaken, for a careful comparison of these frescoes with Ghirlandajo's at S. Trinità, establishes the certainty that the latter antedate the former, and further study reveals that the painter at the Buonuomini may already have had acquaintance with certain figures among the compositions at S. Maria Novella.† If the Buonuomini and the last-named series were, as is probable, contemporary, then all the less likely is it that the only executant of the former was, as Dr. Ulmann suggests, David Ghirlandajo: for just then he must have had his hands full assisting his brother. But in two at least of the frescoes, the Dream of St. Martin and St. Martin and the Beggar, one recognises so distinctly the types, and the rough character which, for reasons that will appear later, may be assumed to be David's, that one can scarcely avoid the conclusion that he painted them himself. The others he may have left to assistants, furnishing the designs, and superintending the execution. Mr. Clough's sketch, the cause of this discussion, may have been drawn, therefore, by David himself.

He also may be connected with a large number of drawings scattered over the whole of Europe, and catalogued under almost every prominent Florentine name from Masolino to Filippino. They are chiefly studies from the model, for action and drapery, done with the silver-point and white, on tinted paper. I would fain spare the reader the pages that follow, but, if he is a student, he will realise the importance of grouping together this series of sketches, and of trying to determine who made them. In the catalogue, all that are known to me will be duly entered under David Ghirlandajo; but here I will be as brief as possible, discussing those only which are most characteristic, or best serve to connect them between themselves, or throw most light on their authorship.

At Berlin there is a sheet ascribed to Domenico Ghirlandajo. On the front are two busts, one of a man, and the other of a boy. Both are peasants recently become townsmen, and have a characteristic look of stupid awkwardness. On the back are three studies after the draped model. One, a man of thirty with coarse features and staring eyes, stands in a rather insolent attitude, holding up his right hand. Another is seated, and his torso is but slightly indicated. The third is a pleasant youth. All are heavily draped, in folds at once flowing and complicated. Something in the types strongly suggests Domenico—whence the attribution—but the quality forbids our believing these sketches to be his, while the draperies are

\* *Repert.* xvii. p. 108.

† Aside from considerations of style, we know from documentary sources (*Vasari*, *Sansoni*, iii. p. 463) that the Acts of Mercy in this chapel could not have been begun earlier than 1482.



distinctly not his, but of a system approaching nearer to Amico di Sandro and Filippino.

The seated figure on this sheet is sufficiently like one on the back of a leaf at the Uffizi [No. 309] to leave no doubt that both were done by the same hand, and perhaps after the same model. Alongside of the Uffizi figure we find another standing with a book in his left hand and a staff in his right. He is well draped, and hatched with close, determined zigzag strokes, recalling Filippino much more than Domenico, to whom this sheet also is attributed. On the front are two other men, one seated and the other kneeling. The latter is more Ghirlandajesque, while the former is more Filippinesque both in types and technique.

Another leaflet in the Uffizi [No. 283], again ascribed to Domenico, has three figures on each side [Plate lxxii.]. Of those on the back one is a youth, the same model as at Berlin, and treated in precisely the same fashion. Beside him stands a somewhat older person, heavily draped but for his right shoulder, and looking slightly to right. His attitude and dress are both freely copied from the man on the extreme right, probably the painter himself, in Leonardo's Adoration of the Magi. On the back are three other men. The one on the right is less draped, and of coarser, more staring countenance, but otherwise like the last figure. The next stands with his head thrown back, and points vehemently downward. The last has his left arm akimbo, his right hand held high around a staff, and stands with legs wide apart. His pose recalls the Ghirlandajo Heroes in the Palazzo Vecchio, and many others from Castagno's down to Perugino's. These last three figures are shaded with the close, zigzag strokes that we have already encountered, have long feet, and legs drawn in slovenly fashion. With this sheet we must inevitably connect one at Lille [No. 288] ascribed to Filippino; for the figure on the front on the extreme right here corresponds to the one on the back on the extreme right there, with the difference, however, that this one is even nearer to the Leonardo from which it is copied. The second figure at Lille recalls the one at Berlin with his right hand held up, and the Uffizi one with his arm akimbo, but is even more Castagnesque. The third is seated, and is of the heavy staring type of the last-mentioned Berlin man, or of the one on the extreme right in the Uffizi sheet [No. 283 recto].

Still another Uffizi leaflet [No. 308] ascribed to Domenico Ghirlandajo has on the back three figures, of which the middle one differs but slightly from the middle one in the Lille sheet. But mere resemblance of type apart, there is here no absence of proof that it is by the same hand as all those that we have already examined. It has the same system of draperies, the same hands, the same hatching, and the same badly drawn legs. Among the sketches, on the front of this same sheet, a kneeling youth is interesting because he is more than usually Filippinesque.

Lest I convey the impression that most of the drawings of this series are ascribed to Domenico, I will now speak of several that are differently attributed. Thus, the back of the last Uffizi leaflet discussed [No. 308], is, touch for touch,

almost identical with the front of No. 113 in the same collection, ascribed nevertheless, to Masolino. In the British Museum there is a leaflet attributed to Masaccio with two figures on each side. The one with a book is the person on the extreme right in Uffizi 308 verso, with the difference that he has given up pointing sententiously, and taken to reading. Although ascribed to Masaccio, these British Museum figures are among the most Ghirlandajesque of this series. One is a youth in full armour, another is a draped figure seen sideways, and the third is a seated nude. The last barely fails of being Domenico's. Clothe this figure, and you have one at Lille [No. 304], ascribed to Masaccio again. His hand is noteworthy, for it is almost identical in form with one in a pen-sketch of a bishop, by Domenico in the British Museum. Beside this Lille figure, lies on the ground, asleep, a youthful nude, and he leads us over to another sheet at Lille [Nos. 81, 82], ascribed this time to Botticelli, whereon, front and back, we find six nudes. They also are Ghirlandajesque, yet can scarcely fail to suggest Pollajuolo. To Botticelli again, is ascribed at the British Museum, a sketch for two men, one of Filippinesque countenance, standing, and the other intended for a St. Jerome, in cardinal's robes, seated. Both have our draughtsman's favourite Castagnesque insolence of attitude, his characteristic folds, and rapid zigzag hatching.

This St. Jerome vividly recalls another certainly by the same hand, although of still more pronounced Castagnesque character. He is on the back of a sheet at the Albertina [S. R. 26], and until recently was ascribed to Baldovinetti. Beside him is a draped kneeling figure, done in most summary style, with the hair indicated as one mass of rapid zigzag hatching. On the front are two figures, of which the one on the right would seem, if we may judge by the large angular folds, to have been copied out of some work by Domenico Veneziano. Both are most characteristic of our draughtsman, particularly for the hatching, and the slovenly sketching of the legs, and endless feet. We shall find these traits in most of his drawings, but scarcely another such close parallel as is offered by a sheet at the British Museum, ascribed this time to Castagno. On the one side are three men, two of them in profile reading, and the third in short cloak turning away. He seems to be the same model as the one to left on the recto of the last Albertina sheet. On the other side of the London leaflet are two figures, one draped, and seated musing, the other a sketch of a stout nude porter posing as a St. Sebastian. He occurs, identical in treatment as well as type, in several Uffizi drawings ascribed to Filippino [No. 158 for example].

In the appended catalogue, the student will find drawings by the same hand ascribed to Fra Filippo, Pesellino, Pollajuolo, and Verrocchio as well. They have the same characteristics as those we have already examined; and although any two taken at random might, to the untrained eye, not seem by the same author, yet to even such an eye could other sketches, serving as connecting links, bring conviction. Many of them would seem to have come out of the same sketch-book. All speak for the fact that their author stood very close to Domenico Ghirlandajo,

while not hesitating to imitate or even copy other masters, chiefly Castagno, Pollajuolo, Botticelli and Filippino—whence the attribution of his work to these and kindred masters.

I must now try to win over the reader to the idea that the author of this whole group of sketches was David Ghirlandajo. The task is by no means easy, for, while we know that David assisted Domenico, through the whole of the latter's career, we possess scarcely more than a single work, which is certainly of his hand alone. That one is the fresco of the Crucifixion with St. Bernard and St. Romuald kneeling, formerly at S. Maria Nuova and now in the Uffizi. We are thus left to pick out, in the paintings usually ascribed to Domenico, the parts that David may have executed. This would be relatively easy, if David had been his brother's only assistant. But there were others, such as the youngest brother Benedetto, and the brother-in-law Mainardi. Fortunately the last-named painter's manner is fairly well known to us from his works at S. Gimignano and elsewhere, and Benedetto also is clearly defined by such a painting as the Louvre Carrying of the Cross. Benedetto indeed can be discounted, for Domenico is not likely to have permitted this brother, so contemptible an artist, to execute any but very subordinated parts. We can, with fair reason then, assume that such parts of Domenico's works as are not his own, must be assigned either to David or to Mainardi. Proceeding in this way, I conclude that the following typical bits of works or whole works may be assigned to David:\*

In Berlin the Resurrection (originally at the back of the S. Maria Novella altar) in which the figures at least must be by him. In Berlin also the Madonna with St. Francis and a Bishop [No. 68]. The ears in both these works, let me add, have the same form as in the fresco of the Crucifixion. In the Vespucci Chapel at Ognissanti, the whole of the lower fresco representing the Deposition. Parts of the Narni Coronation. The SS. Sebastian and Roch in the Museo Civico at Pisa. At Florence the execution of the Heroes at least in the great fresco of the Palazzo Vecchio. In SS. Trinità I suspect his hand in the fresco of Francis before the Sultan. At S. Maria Novella, the entire Sposalizio would seem to be his; all but the portraits in the Visitation; and most of the Presentation of the Virgin, not to speak of other figures here, there and everywhere.

It will be observed that all these paintings are characterised by a certain heaviness and uncouthness of type and action, and by a certain looseness of drawing. I do not stand alone in refusing to accept them as of Domenico's hand; and I venture to believe that the student, who will consider them patiently, will agree that they are by the same hand, and that that hand is not Mainardi's.

Returning to the series of drawings—it has been agreed that we shall not think of ascribing them to Domenico himself. Apart from the consideration that

\* It will be remembered that I would assign to David two at least of the frescoes at the Buonuomini di S. Martino. These last, while sharing in all the characteristics of the other paintings here enumerated, enjoy the distinction of seeming to have been his own venture, unaided by Domenico.



they are of such inferior quality to his own indubitable sketches, they betray a too unstable and eclectic turn of mind. Domenico surely would not have veered so much toward Filippino. On the other hand, they are, on the whole, too close to Ghirlandajo to be withdrawn from his circle. Who then of that circle could have been their author? We need scarcely consider Benedetto. Alunno di Domenico we know, and while one or two drawings, which I ascribe to him, are hardly to be distinguished from one or two others of the group we have now in hand, yet the mass of these is not to be connected with Alunno. The same holds true of Granacci, as we shall see presently. We thus are again left to choose between Mainardi and David.

Let us recall the character of this group of sketches. The features are apt to be coarse, the expression staring or bold, the attitudes violent and strutting, the draperies tossed and tormented. I ask the initiated student, whether this description answers to Mainardi's artistic personality as we recognise it in works that we all accept as his. Scarcely. But it fits David I believe, if I am right in assigning to him what I have done.

This tedious tale must have an ending, and I will not lengthen it further. Yet I venture to believe that comparisons of a very minute sort, instituted between the paintings just attributed to David and the drawings discussed, will bring to light such points of likeness or even identity as will persuade the competent person that they must be by the same hand. Here this shall not be undertaken, for the same competent person, now that the materials are ready and the problem posed, will have no difficulty in completing the task for himself. I venture to believe that our conclusions will not diverge greatly.\*

A few sketches in other techniques may also be assigned to David. In the first place, and with sound security we may give him a cartoon in black chalk, in the Santarelli Collection of the Uffizi for the head of the soldier in the lower left hand corner of the Berlin Resurrection, a picture, the figures of which, at least, most critics agree in attributing to David. There are good grounds for supposing that several pen-sketches are by him also. Thus a leaflet in the Uffizi [No. 213] has on the back one of his characteristic draped figures, but on the front pen-studies for a kneeling angel and children, doubtless for a Nativity. Now the pen-stroke here is distinctly Ghirlandajesque without being Domenico's, and the lower child's face is rough. These considerations, and the presence on the back of a sketch certainly David's, make the attribution to him of the front fairly safe.

\* I will cite one or more points of obvious identity. Thus the type of the Pisa St. Roch which occurs again and again at S. Maria Novella is perfectly identical with a sleeping figure in an Uffizi drawing [No. 255]. Two of the studies of nudes, one at the British Museum and the other in the Uffizi [No. 158], may actually have served for the Sebastian in the Pisan panel just mentioned. The heads in the extreme left above Christ in St. Martin's Dream at the Buonomini di S. Martino are in the exact character of the two heads on the Berlin sheet. At Narni, the drapery of the lower part of St. Anthony is of the exact character of those in the drawings. But most interesting of all for our purpose are a draped male figure seen coming toward us in the S. Maria Novella Visitation, and the Heroes of the Palazzo Vecchio. Drawings like Uffizi 283, and Lille 288 for instance, would almost seem to have served as studies for these last-mentioned frescoes.

And for this we find a certain confirmation in the study of a fife-player, on the back of Domenico's Uffizi design for the "Sposalizio" fresco at S. Maria Novella. The execution of this fresco, it will be remembered, we found to be David's. The fife-player does not occur in the design, and was sketched on the back, not by Domenico, of whom it is unworthy, but by the executant David. If we compare the stroke in this fife-player with the pen-work in the kneeling angel, we shall observe that, except where the latter is cross-hatched, they agree perfectly. With less security, yet with a certain probability, we may further ascribe to David a study of drapery at Lille [No. 231]. It is rather drily and painstakingly hatched, and then heightened with white, and would seem to have served for the figure on the extreme left in the S. Maria Novella fresco representing the Assumption of the Virgin. Finally it would not be disparaging to David's very modest fame, if we assume, as we may, that a pen-drawing in the Uffizi [No. 112°] after certain of the reliefs and medallions on—if I mistake not—the arch of Constantine, was also by him. It certainly is too niggling to be by Domenico, to whom it is ascribed.

### III

Ridolfo, the son of Domenico, was at his father's death, too young to have profited much by his instruction; and yet the one indubitable drawing by him which remains—the Funeral of Zanolì [Plate lxxiv.], in the Corsini at Rome, a study for the picture in the Uffizi—reveals that, whatever other influences may be discerned in his paintings, as a draughtsman he was, through the medium doubtless of his uncle David, the close adherent of his father's manner. We find the same shorthand, and the same sort of calligraphy, feebler it is true, yet better than his finished works would lead us to suspect. An interesting comment, this, by the way, on the minor Florentines. Almost without exception, even the lowest of them are not without a certain merit as draughtsmen, and they are always better in their drawings than in their paintings. This does not hold true of the Umbrians, and of the North Italians, among whom the exact opposite was the case. Happily their smaller men have left but few drawings; but how worthless they are beside their pictures!—pictures seldom wholly lacking in charm of colour, or in quality as painting. Of course I have in mind chiefly the Venetians and their dependents. When a genuine Ferrarese or Milanese is a poor draughtsman—and nearly always he is—his painting seldom bribes us into forgetting it.

We may possibly agree in the attribution to Ridolfo, of a sketch in the Uffizi [No. 73] representing a Bishop blessing a sick Man. The latter is very Raphael-esque, in a manner that soon became Ridolfo's. One other drawing of even more distinctly Raphael-esque character may be his. It is the well-known head done in black chalk, in the Malcolm Collection, there attributed to Raphael and recently again claimed for him as authentic. Now I do not have an exaggerated opinion

of Raphael's power as a draughtsman, but this particular head is very many degrees below his worst ; and to ascribe it to him, seems to me to be carrying on this noble pursuit of connoisseurship without counting the one ultimate count—the quality. Whether, on the other hand, this head is, as has been maintained, by Ridolfo I should be equally at a loss either to affirm or to deny. Ridolfo certainly *might* have done it, and to my eye it seems that in the treatment of the hair he betrays his hand.\*

## IV

Francesco Granacci, like Ridolfo whom he influenced so largely, was active chiefly in the sixteenth century ; yet his manner, despite his pilferings from such of his younger contemporaries as Pontormo, was so much either that of a Quattrocentist pure and simple, or of one not really developing a newer style, but simply declining upon the older, that we shall do best to study him here, in connection with his masters the Ghirlandajo. Was Ghirlandajo, however, his only master ? His paintings leave the question undecided for in them, from the first, Granacci betrays eclectic tendencies which make it possible to assume that, while learning under Domenico and David, he may have strayed to other studios to pick up what crumbs he could. Thus might we explain the dose of Credi that we take in with his earliest independently worked pictures, the Nativity belonging to M. E. Richtemberger of Paris, and the Madonna with the Baptist and St. Michael in the Berlin Gallery [No. 97]. But, another story is told by his drawings. True, only a few of these pass under his own name : those only which are obviously connected with recognised paintings, and as it happens of his maturer, later years. But even these have a certain smoothness, and sleekness, which point back to a mass of earlier sketches ascribed, some to Pollajuolo, some to Botticelli, others to Ghirlandajo, and still others to Credi. How the various other ascriptions—I have not mentioned all—may have arisen might furnish an interesting chapter in the history of connoisseurship. But the connection with them of the names of Credi, Ghirlandajo, and in a less degree of Sandro, is not without significance ; for Granacci's art does indeed seem to have been compounded of unequal parts of these three greater masters.

As I have said, his paintings would leave the question of his origin obscure. His sketches, on the other hand, give no uncertain answer. Even when most Ghirlandajesque in form and structure, they tell plainly by their smooth, almost over-nice handling, and by the daintiness of the hatching, that their author was taught drawing by Credi. In the group of studies by Granacci actually ascribed to Lorenzo, the connection with the latter's style is of course very close, or indeed they never would have been attributed to him. Yet the sheet which in many respects makes the nearest approach to Lorenzo is attributed to Ghirlandajo. It

\* Cf. the Evangelist in the Way to Golgotha at the National Gallery.



is in the Uffizi [No. 307] and shows a draped figure and two lovely heads of children. They are sweeter, lovelier perhaps than any of Credi's heads, but otherwise they might pass unquestioned as his. The close connection between such a sheet as this and many a one of Lorenzo's, as, for instance, Uffizi No. 111, or better still Louvre No. 203, and His de la Salle No. 41, would be indeed inexplicable if we could not assume that, in every probability, Granacci had first been taught by Credi. The more one will compare the sketches of these two masters, the more plausible and acceptable must this idea become.

Here I will not argue about the attribution of most of Granacci's studies, leaving that disagreeable task for the briefest possible treatment in the catalogue. I would but add that other sketches which may be assigned to Granacci, such for example as Uffizi No. 112, are, at first glance, scarcely to be distinguished from David's. We are justified in inferring therefore that, of the two brothers, the real schoolmaster was not Domenico but David. Thus, even in Granacci's more ordinarily Ghirlandajesque drawings it is the latter's rather than the former's influence that is felt.

Among the earliest of his drawings\* which may have served for an extant painting is one ascribed to Domenico, or, to be exact, to his "manner." It is a head in the Uffizi [No. 80], the proportions and features of which are beyond mistake those of Granacci in such an early phase as, for example, is revealed by his very Ghirlandajesque Madonna with Michael and the Baptist at Berlin [No. 97]. In fact between Michael's head in that panel and our drawing there is almost identity. Next in date must be placed the elaborate drawing also in the Uffizi [No. 128] for the St. Jerome in that altar-piece in Berlin [No. 88] which, although in part designed by Ghirlandajo, was executed to the extent at all events of the landscape, Francis, Jerome, and most probably the Baptist also, by Granacci. His sketch differs only in materials from the finished head, and has no especial interest.

To a much later period belong the two sheets in the Uffizi [Nos. 347<sup>F</sup>, 349<sup>F</sup>; Plate lxxv.] containing studies for those two panels relating the story of Joseph which, if I mistake not, are the ones seen by Vasari in the houses of Pier Francesco Borgherini [now Uffizi, Nos. 1249, 1282]. The studies are for heads, hands, and arms, and it would be wearisome to go through the account, although there is nothing in the sketches which will not tally with the finished works. Tame and smooth, yet not without a certain sweet charm in his paintings, in his drawings, as these leaflets bear witness, he shows the same character, but happily somewhat mitigated. In place of the too glossy finish almost as of Leonardo's brood of Milanese, we have here a pictorial handling of white and a use of the pencil characterised by considerable vigour. Granacci appears to even better advantage in a large red chalk design also in the Uffizi [No. 348] for

\* Still earlier are Uffizi No. 82, and sketches for a kneeling Madonna on Nos. 295, and Santarelli 7, as well as some of the studies in Rome for children, all of which may have been done in connection with M. E. Richtemberger's Nativity.

a head of Christ [Plate lxvi.]. Unaccountably ascribed to Franciabigio, it is nevertheless in every touch and in every feature Granacci's. The proportions of the face should be enough to establish his authorship, as any one who will take the trouble to look through Granacci's works will readily see. Here he is to some slight extent, as appears in the use made of red chalk, under Andrea del Sarto's influence. Perhaps the emulation of that great painter inspired Francesco to seek and find a quality of modelling which, modest as it is, he attained but seldom.

Granacci's most spirited drawing, one in black chalk for a Lucretia, at the Uffizi [No. 198], has the honour to pass as Botticelli's [Plate lxxvii.]. We observe, to begin with, that this sketch, in spite of its obvious Cinquecento character, is the work of a follower of the Ghirlandajo. We see this clearly enough, in the way the eyes, the nose and the mouth are indicated, and in the draperies tending to end up, as among the Umbrians, in tiny folds. From the manner in which these folds blow out to the side, it further appears that the author of this drawing—itsself doubtless for a painting—was acquainted with Piero di Cosimo's *cassone*-fronts. Proceeding to the type and general character, I think that one who happens to have in mind such of Granacci's works as the altar-piece in the Florence Academy, the St. Apollonia predella now also there, the various single figures of saints once accompanying the latter and now at Munich [Nos. 1061-64] and the Nativity also at Munich [No. 1065], will without needing to go, as I have, to less known works, readily recognise their singular kinship with this sketch. In the Munich Nativity the Virgin has the exact look of our Lucretia. In the Florence Academy altar-piece the St. Catherine is like our drawing not only in features, but in action. Coming now to minuter considerations, I would invite comparison between the draperies in the sketch and those in Granacci's paintings mentioned above, and also in the Uffizi panels with the Story of Joseph already referred to. Compare them especially with the draperies of the female lightly clad, a boy running beside her, seen in the middle distance of the picture wherein is represented Joseph presenting his people to Pharaoh. With the right hand of Lucretia compare in the same panel, in a group in the foreground, a little to the right, an old man pointing, or in the companion picture, the outstretched hand of the officer leading Joseph to prison. With the left hand and the peculiar bend in the forefinger, compare the right hand of Joseph in Granacci's Holy Family at the Pitti Gallery [No. 345], there, if I mistake not, still ascribed to Peruzzi.

Yet another sketch which much puzzling over, more study, and some reasoning have led me to ascribe to Granacci, is the pretty but feeble study, in the Uffizi, for the youngest of the three Kings [No. 1247]. There catalogued as of the school of Ghirlandajo, it has pleased that father of confusion, the late Dr. Ulmann, to attribute it to Botticelli.\* I cannot readily conceive a greater difference not only

\* "Botticelli," p. 60.

in artistic quality, but also in artistic purpose than, for my eye, exists between the niggling, unfunctional system of draperies here, and the matchless swing of the folds in that one of Botticelli's Adorations—the one in the Uffizi—for which Dr. Ulmann would have us believe this sheet was a study. That this sketch is at all events Ghirlandajesque no proper student of Florentine painting has a right to doubt. But the influence of Credi and Piero di Cosimo is also discernible. The soft sentimental look, the treatment of the hair, and the technique tend to persuade me that here again it is with Granacci we are dealing.\*

## V

Alessio Baldovinetti's seed was destined to bear its fullest fruit not through Ghirlandajo, but through one who, without having necessarily been the actual pupil of Alessio, was yet moulded by his influence, one who, when at his worst—and generally he was at his worst—was scarcely at all an artist, but, when at his best, did not fall short of Ghirlandajo. The careful student of Cosimo Rosselli's fresco at S. Ambrogio, so natural yet splendid in arrangement, and so delicate in its contours; of the charming Nativity which Miss Hertz has at Rome; of another Nativity in the Corsini Gallery at Florence, which there is every reason for ascribing to him; or of the Triumph of Chastity at Turin [No. 106], with its companion in the National Gallery [No. 1196], the Combat of Love and Chastity, both in my opinion Rosselli's—the careful student of these works will, I dare say, not think of placing them beneath any of Ghirlandajo's.

Cosimo, as we know, began his career under the stupid, yet amusing, and at times even winning Neri di Bicci.† It has not been so well recognised that on

\* It is possible that if ever we get better acquainted than we are at present with Raffaele Botticini, we may have to attribute to him some of the drawings that in the appended catalogue are given to Granacci and to David Ghirlandajo. The two authenticated works by Raffaele known at present are a "Pietà" in the Uffizi, painted in 1508, and a Nativity in the Hermitage, dating from 1512. In the predelle to the former work we observe figures which remind us vividly of David and Granacci, while the landscape betrays the influence of Credi. In the "Pietà" itself we are still more reminded of Granacci. In the Nativity we see a picture that, at first sight, might be mistaken for Granacci's. It thus would seem probable that Raffaele, after learning the rudiments of painting from his father Francesco, came into close contact, first with Credi, and then with Granacci, and that with the latter the connection must have been lasting. But in the Nativity we meet with still another element, in the exquisitely drawn masonry of the ruin in the middle distance. Now this way of painting masonry Raffaele could have acquired from Botticelli only. I find masonry of the same kind in a pretty Nativity belonging to M. Gustave Dreyfus of Paris—a picture which betrays slight touches of Botticelli's influence in the Virgin's head and hands as well, but is, in other respects, the product of a follower of Credi. In the landscape of M. Dreyfus' picture I discover affinities with the landscapes in the Uffizi predelle, and it seems to me highly probable that the Nativity at Paris is also by Raffaele; all the more, as I note a considerable resemblance to a Nativity by Raffaele's father, Francesco, belonging to the Marquise Arconati-Visconti of Paris. If it is, then an impression I have that a drawing at Stockholm is again by him would be considerably fortified [Plate lxxviii.]. This drawing, ascribed to Filippino, is a study for a Virgin in a Nativity. One sees at first glance that it has much in common with Credi, but that, nevertheless, it is by a later hand. One thinks of Granacci, too, but that idea must also be dismissed. I recognise in the finely cut nose a likeness to the noses of the Magdalen in the "Pietà" and of the Barbara in the Hermitage Nativity, and, in the folds of the draperies, strong resemblances to the Virgin's drapery in the last mentioned work. But if the Paris Nativity is indeed Raffaele's, my hypothesis gains, for the folds in that panel are even closer to those in our drawing, and the probability is thus increased that the sketch is Raffaele's, and that it was for a Nativity painted between the one in Paris and the other in St. Petersburg.

† It is my impression that we possess at least one drawing by Neri [Uffizi, No. 157, Plate lxxix.]. See catalogue.



leaving Neri's studio, Rosselli must have worked under Benozzo. The connection between these two painters must strike the student of any of Rosselli's more elaborate paintings, but nowhere else will he see it with such surprising clearness as in the most important of the few drawings by him which I have been able to discover.

These drawings are on a sheet belonging to Mr. G. T. Clough of London. On the one side we have studies for a Paul, for two Baptists, two kneeling female saints, a Nicolas, and yet another saint [Plate lxxx.]. The types, the attitudes, and the draperies can leave no doubt regarding their authorship.\* The male figures are vigorous and free from Rosselli's too frequent tendency to caricature. The female heads have the charm that he could give them when he would. The affinities with Benozzo will not escape notice. They extend to particulars. Note the resemblance between the Baptist's arm here and in Benozzo's picture in the gallery at Perugia [Sala V. 34]; with the saint whom I cannot identify, compare the one in Benozzo's drawing in the Dyce Collection at S. Kensington. On the reverse of the sheet we have a large sketch of the Florentine lily, and two or three slight, but charming notes for a Madonna in an Adoration—perhaps. These have something of the delicacy of Benozzo's earlier drawings, and are wholly in his manner. One need only look at the cast of draperies and note how like it is to the folds in such of Benozzo's works as the Perugia altar-piece, the Madonna at Vienna, or certain groups at Pisa. On the whole, it must be acknowledged that this drawing, antedating any of Rosselli's existing paintings, gives promise of an excellence that he seldom attained.

Another drawing by Cosimo, inferior to the first, is Benozzesque enough to be catalogued [Uffizi, No. 1092] as "Maniera di Benozzo." It is a sheet in bistre containing various studies such as Christ on the Cross, the Magdalen at the foot of the Cross, the head separately, and the entire figure of the young Evangelist—all, in short, for a Crucifixion. Back of the dominant Benozzesque elements there seems to be here something of Neri di Bicci and the tendency toward caricature inherited from him. It is probable, therefore, that this drawing is Rosselli's, and even earlier than the other.

Still one more sketch may be regarded as Cosimo's. It is in the British Museum and represents the Vision of St. Bernard [Plate lxxxi.]. Its attribution to Fra Bartolommeo is significant. It was made, doubtless, by some one who recognised in its pen stroke and in its garrulous scribbling an affinity with the Frate. But as I trust I have sufficiently established in the catalogue, this design is Rosselli's and of a kind, moreover, which proves him, as scarcely any of his paintings do, to have been the master of Piero di Cosimo, and the precursor of the latter's pupil, Bartolommeo. The pen-drawings of both are characterised by the same frequently idle scribbling. Indeed it is this trait, inherited from his teacher

\* A moment's comparison with such an early work as the St. Barbara altar-piece at the Florence Academy will suffice to establish Cosimo's claim to this sheet.

which, as we shall see presently, helps us to restore to Piero sketches that have been assigned to Credi and Filippino.

## VI

The real patriarch, however, of the Florentine painters belonging to the so-called Golden Age was not Cosimo Rosselli himself, but his pupil Piero di Cosimo, who seems to have lingered on for a long while in his master's studio as foreman. A feebler version of Leonardo on the fanciful side of that many-faceted genius (just as Baldovinetti had been on the side of scientific experiment with vehicles), we should expect Piero di Cosimo to have left a large number of designs wherein he had noted down his strange and capricious visions. But nothing of the sort remains. Even the book of sketches after various animals which Vasari saw in the collection of Duke Cosimo has disappeared. The few drawings which still can be mustered are studies for portraits, or for sacred subjects or landscapes, and exhibit Piero in no transfiguring light as an artist, nor in any signally imaginative phase, but reveal him as, on the whole, a mediocre draughtsman, and confirm the impression his paintings give, that he was an eager eclectic. We shall not be surprised, therefore, to find his stray sketches, like so many of his paintings, passing, until the other day, under the name of the masters he imitated, and chiefly under the name of the masters he imitated most assiduously, Luca Signorelli and Lorenzo di Credi.

Of the six drawings for heads by Piero di Cosimo with which I am acquainted, five are attributed to Signorelli. Two of them are in the Corsini Gallery at Rome, on the two sides of the same sheet. On the one we have an elderly smooth-faced, bald-headed man looking up [Plate lxxxii.]. Nothing could be more characteristic of Piero di Cosimo\* than the drawing of the muscles of the neck and the modelling of the face. You will find it paralleled almost exactly in one of the saints in the Uffizi Conception [No. 81], and again in more than one head in the Visitation painted for S. Spirito, and now belonging to Col. Cornwallis West of Newlands Manor. Scarcely less distinctive of Piero are the mouth and the ear. On the other side is a head in profile with Piero's typical ear. It is a drawing of no astounding merit, but interesting as foreshadowing both of his famous pupils, Fra Bartolommeo, and Andrea del Sarto. Another of these heads in black chalk, like the two in Rome, is in the Uffizi [No. 129]. It has Piero's typical ear, and drawing of the muscles on the neck, and his spirit. Indeed it has considerable resemblance to the head of the erect shepherd in the Berlin Nativity [No. 204]. Yet another head ascribed to Signorelli—on the whole the best—is in Berlin [No. 2381]. The technique, the drawing of the neck and the mouth, and the general character make it certain that this drawing also is Piero's. As the meagre-featured, long-faced personage has considerable resemblance to Dante, and as he wears bay-

\* The attribution to Piero was first given by Dr. Frizzoni.

leaves on his cap, we have here in all probability a study by Piero for a portrait of the poet. One more catalogued as Signorelli's is in the Royal Library at Turin: a smooth-faced bald-headed oldish man, of superior country breed. In the Louvre [No. 2028] there is the sixth head, ascribed this time to no other than Leonardo, of a bald elderly man [Plate lxxxiii.]. I should be at a loss to name a work by Piero more essentially characteristic of him than this sketch. Compare the shape of the skull and the wrinkles on the forehead and the modelling of the face with the Joseph in the Dresden Holy Family [No. 20]. Note the ear and the mouth and see how identical they are with many in Piero's paintings.\*

It will scarcely be claimed that these heads reveal Piero in the light of an interesting draughtsman. There is something slack and sprawling about them, and little if any distinction. Happily he shows to somewhat greater advantage in his pen-drawings. In these we find him leaning now towards Ghirlandajo, and now towards Filippino, but most of all towards Credi. Much, however, as in the types, forms, and even technique employed in these sketches he approaches the artists just named, he never fails to betray his derivation from Cosimo Rosselli. This master's dominant influence reveals itself in essentials—in the way the pupil, so to speak, holds his pen, in the tendency to use it wantonly and loosely for mere scribbling. We have indeed no surer guide than this trait to help us in restoring to Piero drawings which have been ascribed to others. Thus in the Uffizi [Nos. 168, 169, and 170], Joachim in the Temple,<sup>†</sup> and [No. 170] the Nativity, are in general aspect so Filippinesque, not only in movement, and in types, but even in the drawing of the architecture, that I was near leaving them their old attribution to Filippino, adding only the remark that in such drawings Lippi was already almost Fra Bartolommeo. And thus I might have left them had not Hr. Jens Thiis, who was inclined to believe them Credi's insisted on my studying them further. Such further study ended in fully convincing me that these sketches were Piero di Cosimo's. There were many reasons. In the first place, Hr. Thiis was by no means wide of the mark in thinking of Credi in this connection. There certainly are many more reminders here of Credi than we can expect to find in Filippino. They are not Credi's however, not only because of a much more rambling, aimless touch, but also because they are too far Filippinesque. But Piero should remind us of both, as these sketches actually do, and looking closer at the heads, of the males especially, we end by seeing that they are Signorellesque as Piero's are apt to be. But the reason of reasons for assigning them to Piero di Cosimo is the garrulous scribbling of the pen which characterises them, and at the same time distinguishes them from the manner of Filippino, as

\* I find to my no small surprise that Morelli ascribed this head to Credi. Surely the great critic must have let himself be influenced by the attribution to Leonardo. This head, by the way, occurs in an Adoration of the Magi belonging to Signor dei Nobili of Florence, a work done by the hand which in 1487 executed the Departure of the Argonauts formerly in Lord Ashburnham's collection. Whether this hand was Piero's or a pupil's I must leave undecided.

† A third sketch for the same subject is at Lille, where it is ascribed to Ghirlandajo.



well as from that of Credi. For neither of these was, as was Piero, the pupil of Rosselli, and neither therefore could have inherited their master's singular pen-work.\*

Credi was so slavishly imitated in certain drawings by Piero that the most important of them, a sheet in the British Museum, still passes unquestioned as Lorenzo's [Plate lxxxv.]. It contains several studies, such as a group for a Madonna with saints and angels, two separate Madonnas, and a Madonna seated with saints kneeling. No matter under what name you found it, you would scarcely hesitate to ascribe this sheet to Credi. The types, the proportions, the folds, the forms all seem to be his as a matter of course. Nor does the pen-work arouse suspicion. True, the lower group is singularly Leonardesque in technique, but that should not offer matter for surprise, seeing that Leonardo was Lorenzo's elder fellow pupil.

Nevertheless it is this group which betrays the hand of Piero, as we recognised it in the three Uffizi sketches ascribed to Filippino. In the foreground of No. 168 we discover two figures, one at each corner of the composition, kneeling in profile. The one on the left happens to be of startling likeness not only in action but in technique with the kneeling figure on the left in our group. Looking further we are obliged to observe that the way the Virgin's and one of the other heads are put in is the exact way of those same three Uffizi sketches. Still further, and rather unexpectedly, we note that the hands of the other kneeling figures are undigitated exactly like various hands in the same three sketches once more. At this point there can be no question but that this lower group at least is Piero's.

It might yet be argued that the rest of the sheet was not. "Those proportions, those children, those Madonnas must surely be Credi's," it will be said. But the two separate ones have eyes, and nose, and mouth drawn somewhat in the fashion of the Uffizi sketches, and two of the other heads, both in the chief group, one over the child, and the other over the kneeling figure on the right, betray Piero, while the curious hatching, rambling, aimless and yet seldom crossed, is his. Then the shrubs on the ground are identical with those in a drawing that has just entered the British Museum under Piero's name, and the figures at the top in outline are almost identical with outline sketches on another sheet at the Uffizi [No. 218] which is now ascribed to Piero.

Both the sheets just mentioned call for brief notice, as they will confirm the attribution of the one at the British Museum that we have been discussing, and prove even more clearly Piero's imitation of Credi—an imitation seldom striking in Piero's paintings. The Uffizi leaf is, despite its attribution to Piero far more obviously

\* In the Uffizi there is still another sketch of a somewhat different order [No. 173, cat. 2] but also ascribed to Filippino—a most spirited and vivacious drawing, done with mastery and joy, of a female figure, looking out somewhat archly, with her left hand holding up her dress, and a handkerchief fluttering out to right. Neither the touch nor the spirit manifested in this dashing sketch are Filippino's. On the other hand the vivacity, the freshness are quite Piero's, and the action is even more his. Compare it with the movement of the young Evangelist in the Uffizi Conception.

like Credi. Indeed, I cannot well conceive two women more like Lorenzo's in type, in proportions, in forms, in drapery, in everything really but intimate touch. Yet the attribution to Piero is correct. Credi-like as these two figures are in every other respect, as drawing they are too faltering for even Lorenzo, and they are shaded with a close hatching which is not his, but suggestive of Piero. Below these two elaborated figures are four others, three in mere outline, and the fourth scratched over with just such garrulous pen-work as we have noted in the three Uffizi sketches ascribed to Filippino. The left hand of this same figure is moreover undigitated, as frequently is the case with Piero. Of the figures in outline the kneeling one is obviously by the draughtsman who drew the kneeling figures in outline on the Uffizi sketch [No. 168], and on the British Museum sheet ascribed to Credi.

The drawing that has just entered the British Museum under Piero's name is charming besides being interesting. It represents Ariadne more than half nude, asleep on the sword of a pleasant meadow among silent trees. One is at once reminded of the National Gallery Procris. The feeling of the landscape in particular is much the same and the figures resemble one another closely both in action and in proportions. Nevertheless, the drawing is by no means so obviously Piero's as is the painting. The folds of the coverlet in the former are much more like Credi's, and it is only after looking more than once that one perceives that Ariadne's head is of the type of Piero's Madonnas in the Louvre, at Dresden, and elsewhere, and that the shrubs are drawn exactly as in the large sheet at the British Museum. Pasted on to either side of this Ariadne we find two nudes. The one on the right points up with his right hand, and holds the back of his left to his side. In type, and particularly in proportions, he reminds one of Leonardo and Credi, but the hatching is Piero's, and the attitude recalls the statues in the Thanksgiving for the Rescue of Andromeda at the Uffizi—for the Mercury in which, or for some kindred purpose, it might have served. The other nude carries a lamb on his shoulders. The head of this figure is drawn exactly like those of the single Madonnas in the British Museum, but in other respects it is almost identical with figures of shepherds carrying lambs in both the Uffizi [No. 169] and Lille designs for a Joachim in the Temple. Indeed, considering that we have three designs for this subject by Piero, it is not impossible that this figure also was drawn with the same purpose.

A pen-sketch in the Albertina [S. R. 103] is nearly of the same kind, but here we see Piero, as in a number of his paintings, more under the spell of Leonardo [Plate lxxxiv.]. Hence it was ascribed to Credi, until the other day when Morelli discovered its true authorship. But, although any imitator of Leonardo was apt to bear great resemblance to Credi, yet here there is scarcely an excuse for confusion, the type of Madonna and the landscape being so distinct, but most of all the penmanship, with its reminders of Rosselli. In the spacing and in the distribution of the black and white, moreover, we recognise the precursor

of Fra Bartolommeo.\* That Piero descended from Rosselli, and formed the Frate we may learn from yet another sketch for a Nativity [Uffizi, No. 343]. Compare the hatching here with what you find in Cosimo's design at the British Museum for a Vision of St. Bernard. At the same time, he already is even more obviously the master of Fra Bartolommeo. Still one other pen-sketch merits attention, because it shows with rare clearness what an eclectic can take from others and what has become too ingrained for change. Thus in this study† [Uffizi, No. 286] for the two principal figures in Mr. Cornwallis West's Visitation, the types, and the action are of a kind which have gone far to justify an attribution to Ghirlandajo. But the stroke, the touch remain faithful to Rosselli's teaching. That teaching Piero could no more cast off or change than his voice, or his gait.

Even in studies of landscape we find this Rossellesque garrulity of penmanship, as a sketch in the Uffizi witnesses [No. 78P]. This was done in preparation for the largest and most romantic landscape study by a Florentine Quattrocentist now remaining [Uffizi, No. 403P]. Indeed at first sight you are inclined to place it along with those Venetian paintings of the world of nature for which St. Jerome offered an occasion. Here also we have a Jerome kneeling in a "horrid," craggy, jagged wilderness. Piero, however, scarcely could have known nature in such an aspect. He probably was helped to this vision by contemporary German and Flemish engraving.

Piero's latest phase as a draughtsman is not without interest. It is so advanced, so loose—owing largely no doubt to old age—so Cinquecentist that the two drawings which represent it have until very recently passed unquestioned as the works of Albertinelli, the imitator of his own pupil, Fra Bartolommeo. These drawings in soft red chalk with touches of black [Uffizi, Nos. 552, 555] are studies for that Coronation in S. Francesco at Fiesole, dating from Piero's very last days, and scarcely executed throughout by himself, which Vasari blunderingly mentions as a Conception.‡ We shall not be surprised to find that the sketch is in a style far in advance of what the finished work exhibits. That is an enfeebled Quattrocentist's last gasp; but the drawing has a freedom, a softness, and a roundness wholly of the sixteenth century. The types are perhaps nearer to Fra Bartolommeo's than to such of Piero's as, at all events, are better known. But even if the picture did not exist, it seems to me one would have had to ascribe these two drawings to Piero because of the skulls, the shape of the jaws, and the way the

\* That this drawing is Piero's is further proved by the resemblance between the landscape and the Madonna here, with those in the Borghese Nativity.

† First published in an otherwise worthless book on P. di Cosimo by F. Knapp, p. 37.

‡ Dr. Ulmann has anticipated me, not, I fear, by force of insight, but merely by recognising the correspondence. How little he was fit to apply real connoisseurship may be gathered from the fact that, relying upon a forged inscription with the date 1480, in the obvious character of the seventeenth century, he took this Coronation for Piero's earliest work. If his logic had happened to be better than his judgment, what a topsy-turvy view of Piero di Cosimo that would have produced. "Jahrbücher Pr. Kunstsm." xvii. 44 *et seq.*



noses and mouths are put in, not to speak of the stroke and the scant use of cross-hatching.

In the examination of Florentine draughtsmanship as a process of evolution these two drawings are most precious. We have no such other instance of the old going so far beyond its wonted way to meet the new. We started with Piero out of the very midst of the Quattrocento, and he has led us to the studio door of Fra Bartolommeo, while pointing to Andrea del Sarto farther on.

## CHAPTER VII

### FRA BARTOLOMMEO AND HIS FOLLOWING

**I**F we were pursuing blindly a strict chronological order, we should now, at the latest, give our attention to Leonardo da Vinci. But apart from the fact that, being a supreme genius, he was not so subjected to the hold of mere time as were weaker men, and was not, like them, immured in his exact period, we must bear in mind that he really pursued an art in advance of many his juniors, in advance even of one so much younger, and to so considerable a degree his own creature as was Fra Bartolommeo. Leaving therefore the greater artist for later consideration, we shall let the Dominican friar follow closely upon his masters, Cosimo Rosselli and Piero di Cosimo.

As a painter, Fra Bartolommeo ended by losing his first teachers out of sight. It was not in vain that he studied, as no other Florentine, Leonardo's technique and methods, nor was his visit to Venice fruitless of results. There is, in truth, a period in his career when his paintings have a suavity of colour, a subtlety of tone, and a harmony of arrangement—qualities which Leonardo and Raphael and Giorgione had helped him to acquire—recalling as little the crude effects of Rosselli, or the awkward winsomeness of Piero, as if Fra Bartolommeo had never known them. As a draughtsman, however, he did not stray so far from the fold. There is little in his mere handling, whether pen or chalk be his instrument, that does not hark back to the Quattrocento, and more especially to Piero di Cosimo.

To one whose impressions of Fra Bartolommeo have been gathered by noting his more academic and more dexterous paintings only, as empty of artistic beauty as they are big with ambition to excel, an acquaintance with the same artist's pen-drawings will begin with a charming surprise. He will soon have cause to persuade himself that Fra Bartolommeo, had he lived in an age more in harmony with his temperament, would have been another, and scarcely inferior Fra Angelico; that if he had had sufficient sympathy in his own more sophisticated time, he might even then have attained to more than the calm beauty of a Perugino, and to a charm and

tenderness more than of Lorenzo Lotto. He will end by believing that Bartolommeo's hopeless aping of Michelangelo was scarcely due to mere ambition, but to the intolerable lash of that plague of unalloyed democracies—and the Florentine painters formed such a democracy—a public opinion permitting differences neither of idea nor of purpose.

The number of drawings which Bartolommeo executed in his life-time must have been prodigious. After silly nuns had for some time been using them for wrapping and kindling, over five hundred remained of the collection possessed by Suor Plautilla alone. We have no idea how many, hundreds doubtless, studies after the nude were thrown by him into the Bonfire of Vanities organised by his adored Savonarola. What a mass of his sketches are still to be seen, the appended catalogue will tell—and I do not flatter myself that I have been able to note all which now exist. The majority of these drawings are easy, fluent sketches of small figures, done with the pen, apparently with no toil, and many, perhaps most, for the mere pleasure of doing them. There are, for example, scores of studies for the Madonna and Child, with or without attendant saints and angels, in design one so much like the other, that all of them can scarcely have been intended as preparatory sketches. More likely they were scribbled down in moments of idleness or relaxation, his pen moving swiftly over the white sheet, and leaving behind it delicate figures of lovely women, and sweet babes. This was his most natural mode of activity. To do more was to make an effort—beyond a certain point, an effort repugnant to his temperament, if not to his mind.

In all of his pen-drawings, more especially in the earlier ones, Fra Bartolommeo's indebtedness to his first teachers is too obvious to need demonstration. Of Piero particularly\* we have in many of Bartolommeo's sketches for Madonnas constant reminders in the attitudes, the action, and even the types. It is not on this point, then, that we need spend our time. I would draw attention rather to some typical examples of Baccio's art in drawing with the pen, and say a word about their quality.

As early as any of the studies for Madonnas or Holy Families is a closely hatched sketch in the Louvre [No. d'ordre 229] representing the Virgin seated, the Child on her knee, Joseph pensive on the ground to the left, and on the right two kneeling angels presenting the infant John. The types and forms here, while already decidedly Fra Bartolommeo's, are as yet at no great remove from such work by Piero as we see in his *cassone*-fronts. The young artist is scarcely fledged; he holds on tight, and although his stroke is clean and firm, and the line of the Virgin's mantle has a splendid sweep, we have as yet but faint, if any, suggestions of his later will-o'-the-wisp fluency. We need not linger over other sketches of the same period, and of nearly the same subject, which, although far

\* A copy after a very early original by Bartolommeo is in the Uffizi [No. 344, cornice 87] ascribed to Piero. That the real author was Baccio will be seen by anybody who will compare it with his other early drawings. Note especially in this connection the Holy Family and Angels in the Louvre [No. d'ordre 229, photo. Braun, Louvre 32].



from lacking interest as charming illustration, as refined and tender studies of mother and child, which in their emotional tone catch much of Leonardo's subtle spirit, yet do not reveal any new phase of Bartolommeo's draughtsmanship. But soon his flight was perfect, and we find him, one can scarcely say drawing—the word seems too ponderous—one might rather say breathing upon the paper visions as lovely, as diaphanous, as evanescent as the sweet reveries that surprise one at times, leaving a wonder as to whence and how they came. Of this kind is the exquisite sheet in the Uffizi [No. 464, Plate lxxxvi.] representing the girlish Queen of Heaven wafted up in ecstasy out of the midst of a choir of angels who follow her, carolling and dancing in a ring. Yes, it is dream-like in its delicacy, its swift flight, its evanescence. You might be allowed the fancy that here Fra Angelico and Botticelli were blended. Another sketch in the Uffizi [No. 1203] for the same subject is wilder, has more of Sandro than of the painter-saint, but is not inferior in the ætherial swiftness of the lines. And several studies for altar-pieces—for miniature altar-pieces surely—partake of the same loveliness. Their crown is the sketch in the Uffizi [No. 479, Plate lxxxvii.], for a young Virgin enthroned, with tall angels making music beside her, and a group of men and angel worshippers at her feet. The same loveliness of touch again, but with an added graciousness and beauty of type, meet us in such drawings as the one for the Charity in the Uffizi [Plate lxxxviii.], or the various sketches also there for the Woman of Samaria. The Charity answers as only the Flora in Botticelli's Spring to the vision evoked in reading the delicious verses of Poliziano; and as for the Lady of Samaria, she is the sister, and among them the queen, of the fairest beauties moulded by Greek hands in Tanagra or Smyrna.

Of the sketches thus far described scarcely any can be of a date later than 1505. Baccio continued to the end to delight in his pen, but if he gained in vigour, he did not gain in grace, in exquisiteness, in loveliness—those qualities wherewith he was endowed as no other among his exact contemporaries at Florence. But the falling away was gradual. Very charming still are such studies as the one for an Epiphany [Uffizi No. 452], containing echoes of Leonardo, and of a feebler artist, Alunno di Domenico, the book-illustrator of whom I spoke in an earlier chapter. We note a further departure in studies for a Carrying of the Cross [No. 1235] and an Agony in the Garden [No. 472, both Uffizi], the latter however making ample amends by the imaginative conception—a touch perhaps of Venice?—and the breadth of the handling. A distincter note of Venice is sounded in the drawing at Chantilly for a Madonna enthroned in profile on a high pedestal, with a saint below also in profile, and on the step of the throne an angel making music—an originality of arrangement which has scarcely a rival. Yet larger in stroke are most of the pages of M. Bonnat's sketch-book, many of them of great freedom—as for instance, a study for Deposition [Plate lxxxix.]—and nearly all with pretty landscape backgrounds, a peculiarly dainty example being a Baptist seated on the rocks in the midst of delicately placed tree-stems [Plate xc.]. We come finally to

pen-drawings of Bartolommeo's later years, this time serious studies for effects to be produced on the panel, summary, large and masterly, but scarcely of a kind to place alongside of Michelangelo's, while widowed of the grace and sweetness of his earlier sketches. An important example is the singular study in the Uffizi [No. 1204], consisting entirely of nude figures, for that unfinished altar-piece, now also in the Uffizi, over which he toiled and moiled without ever bringing it to completion. Having been, as Vasari tells us, made sport of for his incompetence in the nude, he was determined to prove his accusers wrong. For this one altar-piece are nearly all his existing studies of the nude. His paintings would, I confess, scarcely have waked my attention to Baccio's treatment of the figure. As among so many Venetians whom he recalls, it is adequate, and no more. But this pen-study (and those in chalk to which we shall come later) certainly go a good way to justify the charges brought against him. It does not so much as approach to a rivalry with Michelangelo or Andrea del Sarto, and although it is so strikingly Raphaelesque, it is not of Raphael himself that this sheet reminds us, but rather of some such person as Pierino del Vaga. I derive much greater pleasure from the dashing, un-laboured, almost Tintorettesque study [Uffizi, No. 475] for the Luccese Madonna della Misericordia, or from the more elaborated, but firmly drawn sketch in the Corsini Gallery at Rome, for a St. Antonino giving Alms.

## II

After the pen, charcoal was Fra Bartolommeo's favourite material for drawing. Now charcoals and chalks are materials which do not permit of the subtlety and fluency of line wherein our artist best excelled. They require those larger effects which his younger and vastly superior contemporary, Andrea, knew how to produce; and, as we see in many matchless sketches by Leonardo, they are capable of rendering to perfection the plastic qualities of figures, and the texture of draperies. Bartolommeo using these same materials is far from contemptible; nay, he at times is most excellent, and frequently delightful; but he never attains by their means to a point of supreme distinction. He was essentially an artist with a great feeling for delicacy, for tenderness, for charm. The nude with its potent spell was not for him. Mere size made with him the difference that it invariably does with inferior artists. In an elaborately finished painting his science and industry enabled him to throw thick veils over his incompetence. In drawing, however, the real temperament was bound to reveal itself. The more he laboured, and the larger his scale, the less felicitous was he. The Uffizi stores up his large cartoons for the St. Paul, for the two female saints in the Luccese altar-piece with God the Father, and for other paintings. They may have an archæological interest; I, at all events, am bored by them, when I try to regard them as draughtsmanship. They are in every sense less than the painted figures for

which they served, and have no intrinsic quality. How much more promise there is in the tiny Uffizi sketch [No. 1270] for the Paul, and even in the larger and broader one in the Louvre! It must, on the other hand, be confessed that the smaller drawing at the Albertina for the St. Catherine is no more agreeable than the cartoon at the Uffizi, both being in striking contrast to the finished figure in the Luccese painting, where, however, it is the expression and the colour that make the difference. Nor are Bartolommeo's single heads, when of life-size, and carefully executed, any better. Dr. Frizzoni possesses an excellent example, the head in charcoal of a smooth-shaved man. Artistic value it has none; its chief interest is its amazing likeness to such a head by Piero di Cosimo as the one in the Uffizi. How much more Baccio could achieve when he laboured less, we see in another life-size head (at Weimar) which probably was a study for the St. John in the Pitti Deposition. Here there is far more genuine contact with the structure, far more modelling, something life-enhancing in the breadth of the stroke, something to caress in the soft masses of curly hair.

Even when drawing on a smaller scale, his most elaborate chalk sketches are not to be compared with his finished paintings. I take it that his masterpiece is the almost Giorgionesque Madonna with St. Stephen and St. John in S. Martino at Lucca. Drawings exist for nearly every detail of this altar-piece, and not one of them gives a pleasure equal to the corresponding part in the painting. The Uffizi sketches for the two saints lack the colour and expression of the painting, while possessing no recompensing spontaneity. In truth, even as draughtsmanship the painted figures are much better than those in chalk. And the Louvre study for the Madonna contrasts even less favourably with the picture—not that this drawing is much below Baccio's average, but because the painting is so much above it [Plate xci.]. Indeed wherever the sketch is of a kind to require qualities of structure, we meet with little but disappointment in Bartolommeo's chalk studies. They are boneless, nerveless, soft and vague. He happily does himself greater credit where the problem is one of action, or where the effect is to be scenic rather than plastic. Thus, the Weimar sketch for a helmeted horseman at full gallop attains his highest level. The slim figure forms a compact mass with the horse's head and neck, and one feels the interchange of purpose and spirit between the youth and his charger. Again, the genuine magnificence of the graceful figure waving a sword (also at Weimar) carries one away, and blinds one to many a small fault of drawing. But Baccio is at his best once more in scenic effects with many figures as in the sheet belonging to Mr. Clough, where we see the Children of Israel, and all their lovely women, wandering through the desert; and no less admirable is the Uffizi study for a nude Venus erect on a pedestal, with a host of women and children crowding up to her. The spirit is so fine that one passes over the utter badness of Bartolommeo's female nudes. Happily, in his later days, he elaborated his sketches less and less, executing them with a freedom that suggests Pontormo, as in one in the Uffizi [No. 1267] for a Satyr pursuing a



Nymph; or even recalling the impressionistic Rosso, as in another sketch in the same collection [No. 1271] for an Expulsion of Hagar.

Bartolommeo is less at home still in red chalk, and suffers severely from the inevitable contrast with Andrea. Here, more than ever, his excellence is in inverse proportion to his scale. There is little to rejoice one in the life-size study (at Weimar) for the donor in the Lucchese Madonna della Misericordia. He is seen to much better advantage in such rapid work as the sketch (in the Louvre, No. 80) for an altar-piece; at his best nearly in such studies of children as we find in No. 492 in the Uffizi, or on the charming leaf at Chantilly. Unhappily, Baccio used red chalk for his academies, not only of males, which are less bad, but of females also. The material only brings out his glaring incompetence, an incompetence partly accounted for by the probability that he never used female models. His notion of the female form unhappily anticipated that of Rubens—and, when void of that Flemish Titan's fire and life, we know how odious that may be!

The study, then, of Fra Bartolommeo's drawings has proved essential to our comprehension of his talents. We have seen that they were remarkable; but at the same time we have observed how, under the spur of unsympathetic ideals, and the lash of blind fault-finding he was driven to attempts not only beyond but in fact subversive of his powers. He was an artist of the graceful, the charming, and the vivacious, with a fine sense of colour, and a feeling for splendid arrangement. For grace and charm his pen gave scope; his other qualities could appear in painting; for none was there much chance in his chalk drawings.

### III

For the student's convenience I here will make mention of the more important sketches known to me for paintings still existing, taking these in the alphabetical order of their present location.

*Besancon.* Madonna with Saints and Carondelet as Donor. In the Uffizi, an excellent study in black chalk for the Madonna [No. 522]. An earlier sketch, perhaps for the same, in the Louvre [No. 76]. For the Sebastian, black chalk studies in the Uffizi [Nos. 360, 364, 376, cat. II.]. For Carondelet, in the Uffizi [No. 404 verso, cat. II.]. For the Coronation, originally belonging to this altar-piece, fragments of which, executed by Albertinelli, are now at Stuttgart, a slight pen-sketch in the Uffizi [No. 1235 verso], perhaps another in the British Museum.

*Florence.* ACADEMY. Madonna appearing to St. Bernard. For the entire composition, large study at the British Museum, at the Albertina, the angel in the foreground to left, black chalk heightened with white; at Weimar, the St. Bernard, same materials.

*Florence.* PITTI GALLERY. For the "Pietà," perhaps a pen-sketch in the Uffizi [No. 1239], and another on a leaflet belonging to Herr von Beckerath, and another more important in the Uffizi [No. 495]; for the Christ, a black chalk study in the Uffizi; for the head of John, a sketch in black chalk, at Weimar.

For the picture of St. Mark, a study at the British Museum.

For the altar-piece, Madonna and many Saints: In the Uffizi a very empty more than life-size head [No. 478] in black chalk, perhaps for the Madonna—another for a winged *putto* flying to the right [No. 409, cat. II.]—sketches in black chalk [Nos. 407<sup>F</sup> and 1281] and red chalk studies for the St. Bartholomew [No. 1141]. In the Louvre, study in same materials for same figure. At the Albertina similar for same.

For the Resurrected Christ and the Four Evangelists, in the Malcolm Collection, Nos. 91, 92, in black chalk, 93 in red chalk; in the library of Christ Church, Oxford, one in black chalk; at Mr. J. P. Heseltine's a pen-sketch; at Chantilly, a study in black chalk; another at Mr. Salting's; at Dresden another study in black chalk; in the Uffizi a pen-sketch [No. 474]; at M. Bonnat's in Paris, one in red chalk; in the Louvre, a study in black chalk and white, although in reversed position, probably for the Evangelist on the right.

For the picture of St. Mark a sketch in black chalk at the Uffizi [No. 495]; another sketch there also [No. 405<sup>F</sup>]; a third, with the pen, in the British Museum.

*Florence.* UFFIZI GALLERY. The unfinished altar-piece, commissioned in 1510, seems to have cost Bartolommeo a great deal of effort. He was determined to study every figure from the model, and even from the male nude, but for all that he never completed his task. On the panel as we now see it there is, to my eye, no touch of his own hand visible. Doubtless he made elaborate cartoons, which then were transferred to the panel by an assistant, not unlikely Fra Paolino, preparatory to his putting on the colour and glazes.

For the entire composition, studies with the pen of nude figures, in the Uffizi [No. 1204], and an elaborate design in black chalk and white, belonging to Mr. J. P. Heseltine.

For the Madonna and Child, nude studies in red chalk at the Uffizi [Nos. 470, 1207], also the poor sheet at Munich, and perhaps another at the British Museum. For the Madonna and the Children, an excellent study in the same material at the Uffizi [No. 1206]. For the Madonna, St. Anne and The Children, Uffizi [No. 401, cat. II.]. For the Virgin and Child in final aspect, Uffizi [No. 523].

For the *putti*, two black chalk sketches at Munich; several at the Uffizi (such as No. 470 verso and Nos. 413, 14551, 14552); and a

cartoon in the British Museum, for the one, if I do not mistake, with his legs crossed.

For the infant John, a study in black chalk at the Uffizi [No. 361, cat. II.] and perhaps another [No. 1280]; and still another in the collection of Signor Gustavo Frizzoni at Milan.

For the Evangelist, a good sketch in black chalk and white at the Uffizi [No. 494].

For the picture of Job, a study in black chalk and white at the Uffizi [No. 454].

For the Circumcision [No. 1161], a pen-sketch in the Corsini Gallery in Rome [No. 130496].

*Florence.* S. MARIA NUOVA GALLERY (now in the Uffizi). For the fresco of the Last Judgment,\* in M. Bonnat's Collection a study of various figures in black chalk and pencil, and pen-and-ink sketches for the angels. In the Uffizi, a much effaced and rather dubious study for the Christ as Judge. At Chantilly a pen-sketch for Michael driving the damned before him; in the Louvre, a woman in the last group [No. 1292]; at Munich, an angel blowing a trumpet.

*Florence.* S. MARCO. For the altar-piece, a study in black chalk belonging to Mr. J. P. Heseltine, and for this also is probably a sheet at Weimar in red chalk with several studies from the life for the Madonna.

*London.* MR. LUDWIG MOND. Holy Family. For this, a pen-sketch in the Louvre [No. 1962 verso].

*Lucca.* S. MARTINO. Madonna with the Baptist and Stephen. For the Madonna a study in the Louvre [No. 79]. For the saints two separate studies in the Uffizi [Nos. 458, 483]. All in black chalk and white.

*Lucca.* GALLERY. God the Father with the Magdalen and Catherine. For God the Father, a study from the life in black chalk and white, in the Uffizi [No. 1284]. For the St. Catherine, a black chalk sketch in the Albertina. The cartoons in black chalk and white for both the saints are in the Uffizi [Nos. 1777, 1778].

Madonna della Misericordia. For the right half of the composition, and for the Virgin a splendid sketch with the pen and red chalk at the Uffizi [No. 475]. There also a red chalk sketch for the donor and his patron [No. 481]. At Weimar, in red chalk, the head of the donor.

*Milan.* MARCHESE VISCONTI VENOSTA. Tondo of Holy Family. For this, the cartoon in black chalk and white at the Uffizi [No. 1779].

*Panshanger.* LORD COWPER. Holy Family. For the Infant John, two black chalk studies in the Uffizi [Nos. 368 and 14550, cat. II.].

*Paris.* THE LOUVRE. "Noli me tangere" [No. 1115], still ascribed to

\* A well-preserved late sixteenth-century copy *al fresco* of this interesting composition may be seen in one of the cloisters of St. Apollonia.



Albertinelli despite the documentary proof that it is Bartolommeo's.\* A pen-drawing in the Uffizi [No. 484], containing two studies for the subject is for this picture, although it is of inferior conception. Another sketch in the Louvre is for an earlier, less Leonardesque phase of the composition.

Madonna and Saints, and mystic marriage of St. Catherine [No. 1154]. For the composition as a whole, a study in black chalk, at the British Museum, and another at Lille [No. 43]. For the young female saint, a sketch in black chalk and white at the Uffizi [No. 1285], and a smaller one there [No. 371, cat. II.]. For the Francis and Dominic embracing, a study in black chalk and white at Lille. For the Catherine and the other female saint, a sketch in the collection of Herr von Beckerath.

The Annunciation and Saints [No. 1153]. For the Baptist, perhaps the study from life in black chalk and white at the Uffizi [No. 1283]. For the drapery of his half-bare arm, perhaps the sketch there also in the same materials [No. 1281].

*Rome.* THE LATERAN. For the St. Paul, two small but spirited sketches in the Uffizi [Nos. 474 and 1270], and a larger one [No. 356, cat. II.], a similar one in the Louvre, and the cartoon in the Uffizi [No. 1781]. All in black chalk and white.

For the St. Peter, an excellent sketch in the Uffizi [No. 485], and the cartoon in black chalk and white also there [No. 1782].

*Vienna.* IMPERIAL GALLERY. The Circumcision. Study for the Madonna and Simeon, in the Malcolm Collection [No. 94] in black chalk heightened with white. For the Joseph, in the Uffizi [No. 384, cat. II.].

The Rape of Dinah—designed only by Baccio, executed later by Bugiardini. Various sketches with the pen or red chalk on the same sheet, in the Uffizi [No. 475 verso]. For a female figure, two studies in black chalk and white at the Uffizi [Nos. 471, 1245].

#### IV

A very exquisite, not a great draughtsman have we discovered in Fra Bartolommeo, and we shall not be surprised to learn that his followers have inherited all his weaknesses, all his mannerisms, and scarcely a touch of his grace. First in the list stands Albertinelli, his fellow pupil and partner.

As a painter, Mariotto was inferior to the monk, but he takes, notwithstanding, fairly high rank among the less gifted artists of his time. His pictures certainly

\* Cf. Marchese, "Memorie di Pittori ecc. Domenicani," second edition, ii. 196.

would not lead one to expect that their author was either a charming or a vigorous draughtsman. But his drawings with the pen fall even lower than our expectations, and he meets with no great success when using chalks. He thus seems to have been one of those rare Florentines who could paint but could not draw. And he must have been more or less aware of the direction of his talents, and hence have taken Bartolommeo for partner, hoping by his aid to attain to such results as, a little later, were striven for by Sebastiano del Piombo when he attached himself to Michelangelo.

The relative scarcity of his sketches would tend to establish that Mariotto drew little; and we possess a significant confirmation of this opinion. His best known work is the Uffizi Visitation, painted in 1503, and the predelle for that picture are among the most pleasant of Mariotto's works. But the design for one of them, the Circumcision, exists, and it is not his [Uffizi, No. 465]. It is Fra Bartolommeo's, and Albertinelli has followed it slavishly, but not without losing the graceful daintiness of the sketch. We may reasonably suspect, therefore, that all the designs for his masterpiece were made by his more gifted partner.

To perceive the depth of Mariotto's inferiority as a pen-draughtsman, we need only direct our attention to his own undisputed pen-drawings. In a study for the Virgin in an Annunciation [Uffizi, No. 547], we have him in an early phase, when he seems to have made every effort to adopt Baccio's manner and quality. He fails signally, attaining to none of the grace and delicacy of his model, while losing what little firmness of structure that possessed. Yet he never again approached Bartolommeo so closely. It is only when he forgets his partner, and strikes out with something like a Venetian painter's spontaneity that he draws as tolerably as he did in one sketch that remains.

This sketch is in the Uffizi [No. 556, Plate xciii], and is a study for a Trinity with various saints, perhaps for the picture in the Academy representing the Trinity. It is hard to characterise this design. With elements of an almost archaic kind it combines others belonging to the decline of art. Certainly there is nothing wholly admirable about it, yet it is pleasant. The stroke is firm, even worthy of praise.

A word now about his sketches in other and more propitious materials. First, of those in silver-point and white on yellowish tinted paper, a number of which, more or less dubious, pass as his. His certainly is the very early study in the Louvre [No. 4] for a Madonna in an Annunciation [Plate xciv.]. She shrinks back with exquisite grace in a manner seldom affected by Florentine painters save when under some Siennese inspiration. Here, however, Albertinelli is not in direct contact with Siena, but is adopting the Virgin out of Filippo's Annunciation at S. Lorenzo. He has changed but the type, and touched her with Baccio's elegance, keeping Lippi's Madonna in other respects unaltered—even to the swirling draperies. Another noteworthy sheet in these materials, but of later date, and inferior quality, belongs to Herr von Beckerath, and contains

studies for a Madonna. In almost the same materials again is the sketch in the Uffizi [No. 512] for the Angel of the Annunciation in the early work representing that subject at Volterra. The point of chief interest about this drawing is its attribution to Credi whose influence is more clearly discernible here than even in the finished painting.\* For an Annunciation again, we have yet another study [Uffizi, No. 308, Plate xcv.], but this time in red chalk. In the use of this material this sheet has perhaps more resemblance to Fra Bartolommeo's less careful charcoal studies than to those in red chalk. It is doubtless a design from Albertinelli's later years, and by no means wanting in quality: the action is excellent, and the pen-stroke has a freedom and a vigour which go to prove that this was his, a born painter's, most expressive instrument for drawing.

## V

In Fra Paolino, Bartolommeo had, not a companion and partner, but a painstaking pupil, a slavish imitator, and—unhappily for us!—by no means a stupid one. As a draughtsman, Paolino had more talent, it would seem, than any other of his master's followers, certainly much more than Sogliani, for instance. We have found the quality of Baccio's own charcoal drawings at times quite inferior; Paolino's drawings executed during his riper years (when his paintings already were shocking) and in the same materials, certainly lack neither spirit nor pictorial quality; we may infer consequently that, in his earlier years, his work would have been no worse; and the problem arises, therefore, how to distinguish a careless and sketchy chalk study by the master from one by the pupil. It is not to be settled easily. I have done what I could to decide, but I feel no great confidence in some of my conclusions. Not only may I be found guilty of ascribing a sheet drawn by Bartolommeo to Fra Paolino, but, although I trust more rarely, drawings by the latter to the former, and I may at times have confused Paolino and Sogliani. I make this confession all the more readily, as it is one of detail, easily to be remedied by other students, and of no serious consequence to the general tenour of this volume.

As an instance, let me take the very pretty head in the Corsini Gallery at Rome. I think we may safely assume that it is by Paolino—something in the type and in the touch tells us that. It is, however, but a hair's breadth away from such heads which I believe to be by Baccio as the one in the collection of Signor Frizzoni, or the even more charming one in the Uffizi [No. 352, Plate xcii.]. Or again, take such a sheet as the study for an altar-piece [Uffizi, No. 467]. I have catalogued it as Fra Bartolommeo's, not that I am entirely persuaded that it is his rather than Fra Paolino's, but on the good old principle of leaving things where

\* Credi's influence on Albertinelli is visible nowhere better than in an old copy in the Panciatichi Collection of a lost original by Albertinelli, representing a Holy Family, all the figures standing,—a fascinating work.



they are unless there is ample reason for disturbing them. On the other hand, I feel more confident that such drawings as the very loose but by no means unattractive one for a Madonna [Uffizi, No. 1263], or the charming head at Munich for the Catherine in Paolino's Florence Academy altar-piece, cannot be Bartolommeo's. The style of the first of these is already close to that in Paolino's unquestionable designs.

My doubts fall to a minimum before a design like the one corresponding to Fra Bartolommeo's Naples Assumption [Uffizi, No. 1277]. The mere fumbling contours, combined with a close hatching, prove that this sketch was executed by Paolino.

While still with Fra Bartolommeo, Paolino seems to have made a business of producing elaborate copies in black chalk of the pictures that the master was painting. These copies he stored up carefully, ready in later life to fetch them out, and at a moment's notice to manufacture one of those over-stuffed, misbegotten altar-pieces of which S. Paolo at Pistoja preserves the most shocking examples. I need scarcely say that Paolino's black chalk copies generally pass for original sketches by Fra Bartolommeo. One of the very best of these is a sheet in the Malcolm Collection containing a very elaborate copy after the Madonna of Mercy at Lucca, a picture, by the way, in which Paolino did more than a little of the painting. In the Uffizi, among others, there is a copy [No. 456] of the Holy Family now in the Corsini Gallery at Rome.

But the drawings which Fra Paolino executed quite on his own account are in every way of a good quality. Compare, for instance, the design in the Uffizi [Plate xcvi.] for the fresco of the Crucifixion at S. Spirito in Siena, with the finished work. The latter is empty, puffed out, a caricature of Fra Bartolommeo. The sketch, on the other hand, is distinguished by its freedom and spirit. Two other designs, however, also in the Uffizi, are of greater intrinsic value. One is for an Assumption of the Virgin, a composition of many figures well arranged. The other, Paolino's masterpiece, is a study for the Adoration of the Magi, painted in 1526 for S. Domenico at Pistoja, characterised by its excellent pictorial effect, and its relative vigour. The type, by the way, of the Madonna in this design offers sufficient proof that such a sheet as the one containing a large Holy Family (Berlin, Herr von Beckerath) is by Paolino, and from his later years, and not by Bartolommeo, to whom it is ascribed.

Paolino seems to have worked little in other materials. I know very few drawings by him in red chalk, and as few with the pen. Of the latter kind the Louvre contains a most characteristic specimen, a Marriage of St. Catherine [Photo. Braun, Louvre 29]. Here both the types and the touch are as far from Bartolommeo, to whom the sketch is ascribed, as they are close to Paolino.

## VI

This chapter must end with a short account of a painter who, at the start neither pupil nor follower of Fra Bartolommeo, ended by attaching himself more closely to the manner of that master, and of Albertinelli, than to any of the other important painters who were drawing him away from his insignificant self. Giovanni Antonio Sogliani was the pupil and life-long friend of Lorenzo di Credi, and through his entire career he retained the dull smoothness of his teacher's art. As one looks at his productions, one cannot help fancying that for Sogliani the real world did not exist at all, and that he never had seen anything that was not first translated for him into the glossy surfaces of rich oil painting. This sleek, oily vision never deserted him, although in other respects he underwent many changes. He was soon attracted by Fra Bartolommeo and Albertinelli, and somewhat later by Andrea del Sarto, Franciabigio and Granacci. Of course he had little feeling for form; indeed, he might have boasted of being the most boneless painter of his time in Tuscany. But, like all craftsmen without a sense for form, he was least stupid while doing a head.

This must suffice for a description of what, with great charity, we may call Sogliani's artistic personality. His earliest works both in painting and in drawing still pass for Lorenzo di Credi's. The best example of the former is the almost charming Nativity at the Olivella in Palermo [Photo. Alinari 19868]. Drawings of this period are not rare. The Uffizi has more than one specimen, the most interesting being [No. 81] the head of a youth, smooth and lifeless, with watery eyes. (Windsor has a head of an ecstatic youth even closer to Credi.) A better specimen is in the Louvre, the head of a child, already touched with Bartolommeo's manner, and in Sogliani's favourite black chalk. An almost similar child's head in the Uffizi [No. 460] is more advanced, and in fact ascribed to Bartolommeo himself. But Sogliani's derivation from Credi, and his laboured smoothness, have led to the attribution of more than a few drawings by him either to Leonardo himself or to his Lombard following. A flagrant instance of a painting so attributed is at Turin [No. 136], the Madonna seated against a tree with the Child blessing the infant John, ascribed to Cesare da Sesto; of a drawing, the Madonna with the infant John, at the Uffizi [No. 592], ascribed to the Lombard School.

It would seem that when Sogliani left Credi, he turned first to Albertinelli, and that it was Albertinelli who, so to speak, handed him on to Fra Bartolommeo. At Stuttgart [No. 250] there is a tondo bearing the forged signature of G. F. Penni, representing the Holy Family, wherein the figures, though betraying acquaintance with Albertinelli's types, are most clearly Sogliani's, while the landscape and its accessories are so much in the style of Albertinelli\* that by itself I scarcely

\* Cf. particularly the landscape in the Louvre picture begun by Filippino but executed by Albertinelli in 1506.

should know it from his. With such witness to their intimacy we shall scarcely be surprised to find the drawings of the younger ascribed to the elder painter. The most conspicuous case is the Uffizi sketch in red chalk [No. 553] for a Visitation. It was inspired, doubtless, by Albertinelli's famous composition, but is inferior in every way to even his draughtsmanship, is different in treatment, and, as a matter of fact, is Sogliani's study for his picture of the Visitation at S. Niccolò al Ceppo in Florence. The Louvre has a sheet with sketches on both sides: on the one God the Father and an elderly woman seated, and on the other a young female seated,\* and a St. George slaying the Dragon. Although this was done with the pen and bistre, the stroke does not vary from that in the red chalk Visitation, a capital characteristic of the poor draughtsman. (A drawing in the same collection of a Judith with the head of Holofernes, in technique and quality very close to the last, is doubtless a sketch for a picture of this subject mentioned in Vasari's life of Sogliani.)

In his paintings Sogliani frequently imitated Andrea del Sarto. The Florence Academy offers an interesting instance of an altar-piece at once so distinctly Sogliani's as to be obvious to those who have studied him, and yet close enough to Andrea to be attributed to him and to pass almost unquestioned [No. 96]. Yet there are but scanty traces of Andrea's influence in his drawings. The bulk of them were done in imitation of Bartolommeo, and are still catalogued as being by the master. Once or twice he is not so very inferior, as for instance in the large head, at the Uffizi [No. 377F]. Of the drawings where his manner is so unmistakable that they actually are ascribed to him, the best are portrait heads, one, for instance, in the British Museum; another, his masterpiece, in the Uffizi, one of those pastel heads which Vasari mentions with approval. But even these are more in the line of the systematic student's duty, than of the art-lover's pleasure.

Here my account of Fra Bartolommeo and his following must end. My heart fails me in the presence of Suor Plautilla Nelli, and I will leave her for those who are less alive than I happen to be to the distinction between curiosity and art.

\* In type and action almost identical with the Madonna in the Stuttgart picture.



## CHAPTER VIII

### LEONARDO DA VINCI

**I**N his defence of painting as against poetry, a defence which he made with great earnestness regarding both its inherent nobility as a liberal and not merely mechanical art, and its many advantages as an instrument of expression, Leonardo never tires of explaining how small is the power of words to convey clear notions of visible things, and, on the contrary, how well fitted for this task is the craft of the limner. As in his other writings he has anticipated so much of the science of our last two centuries, so, in this defence of the visual arts, he has propounded more than one of the ideas truly essential to the æsthetic criticism that we have been enjoying since Lessing. But it is not my present purpose to speak of Leonardo as a critic, although it is a phase of his genius that has hitherto escaped notice, but of Leonardo as a draughtsman. In this capacity his activity was prodigious, and it was so prodigious precisely because he was of all artists the farthest removed from being the artist merely. The simple painter or sculptor makes his sketches, as many as you will, for a work that he has in hand, and then, like the rest of us, returns to words. But Leonardo's mind was a universe whereof painting and sculpture were scarcely more than outlying continents. His chief interests lay in every form of mechanical and physical science at which a mortal of his day could possibly grasp; and the results of his investigations had to be expressed in words. Now Leonardo when writing connectedly was master of a prose precise, supple, dignified, even elevated, the prose in short of a man of super-eminent genius. Nevertheless, as I have said, he did not believe greatly in the fitness of words to give clear notions of things visible. The consequence was that he seldom, if ever, wrote without at the same time sketching figures to make his meaning clearer. To this practice it is due that so many of his drawings still exist. But may not something else be due to the same practice—his style as a draughtsman?

It is a singular coincidence that while there is no other Florentine who painted so little and drew so much, there is no other whose drawings were so entirely subordinated to a purpose. They either were illustrations to his writings, and

done rapidly and neatly but with no intention that they should possess æsthetic quality; or they were studies from nature meant for Leonardo's own eye alone; or yet again, they were the records of the various stages in the gestation of a work of art to which he hoped to give birth. His drawings being thus invariably subservient to definite ends, his temperamental ardour, expressing itself with the pen or pencil, was never damped or chilled by the practice of over-elaboration. Hence, in even his most highly finished studies you perceive quickly that the elaboration comes from the eye, and not from the hand; that the hand has worked as rapidly there as in the slightest scrawl. Thus Leonardo's habit of drawing at all times and all places must have conduced to giving his draughtsmanship its distinguishing qualities. The need of working quickly must have greatly encouraged his natural spontaneity and readiness. The desire for clearness in his illustrations could not have helped forming habits of precision and neatness, not only of vision, but of notation. His continuous studies from the life gave him such an intimate acquaintance with the workings of bone and muscle, tendon and texture, that no other Italian, and perhaps no other artist whatsoever, has succeeded as he has done in conveying, without the expedients of massive structure and grandeur of pose, a pervading conviction of the existence of the figures he jotted down. And spontaneity, readiness, clearness, precision, intimacy—qualities almost contradictory but in him most harmoniously combined—grew so ingrained in the substance of his mind and in the habits of his hand that they increased as his years advanced. Thus, none of his sketches exhibit them better than such late works as his studies for human anatomy.

The quality of qualities, then, in Leonardo's drawing is the feeling it gives of unimpeded, untroubled, unaltered transfer of the object in his vision to the paper, and thus to our eye; while, at the same time, this vision of his has such powers of penetrating, interpreting, or even transfiguring the actual, that, no matter how commonplace and indifferent this actual would seem to ourselves, his presentation of it is fascinating and even enchanting. And yet so little of effort is there to be perceived in this wonderful alchemy, that it is as if suddenly, by the mere feat of a demiurge, earth were transubstantiated to Heaven.

## II

To treat of Leonardo's drawings in detail and according to their merits would take not a chapter, but volumes. Here I can but speak of a few which, either for the light they throw on his paintings, or because of their exceptional beauty, have special claims to attention. But first a word regarding his derivation as a draughtsman, his materials, and his mannerisms.

We know that Leonardo's master was Verrocchio, and it is not surprising that this artist's influence should be manifest in his work. It is far more interesting

to note that in the actual handling of the pen, in the manner of sketching the figure, and in the designing of the extremities—such a tell-tale feature—Leonardo should seem almost to have passed over his own immediate teacher and gone back to that master's master, the greatest of the draughtsmen of the fifteenth century, Antonio Pollajuolo. The next of kin to Leonardo's swiftest and most flame-like renderings with the pen of the human figure are none of Verrocchio's drawings, but such of Pollajuolo's as the Hercules of the British Museum [Plate xiii.] or the Baptist at the Uffizi [Plate xiv.]. And how indelible was the impression of Antonio on Leonardo we may judge from the fact that we never perceive it so clearly as in his late anatomical studies.

The bulk of Leonardo's drawings are with the pen, for he used the instrument with which he wrote, to illustrate his text. The silver-point he took in hand when he wished to give a delicate effect of plastic precision and high finish. Black chalk and white were his preferred materials when he was passing into the last stages of preparation for a work of art. Red chalk he used somewhat more sporadically, but chiefly, perhaps, for such sketches as he least intended to use for finished pictures. Pastel also must have been in his hands a good deal during his stay at Milan. At least such a close follower as Boltraffio certainly used it. The only trace of it in Leonardo's own works is met with in his cartoon for the portrait of Isabella d'Este.

Left-handed, Leonardo reversed not only the shapes of the letters in writing, but the direction of the lines in drawing as well.\* The stroke is almost invariably from left to right, with the rare exception of such shading as imperatively demands the counter-stroke. Morelli was the first to draw the necessary conclusion from this observation. It is that there is every presumption against the authenticity of a drawing in which the stroke goes from right to left. It does not, of course, follow that the direction of the lines is, by itself, a sufficient test of authenticity in the case of a sketch ascribed to Leonardo. Here as elsewhere, the spirit and the quality must be the umpires. There are a number of Leonardesque drawings in which the stroke is from left to right, yet certainly they are not Leonardo's. Either they are out-and-out forgeries, or slavish copies, or else the work of pupils who in their enthusiasm imitated this among the other mannerisms of the master.

Perhaps this is as convenient a place as any to mention a few typical examples of such imitations. In the Academy at Venice there is a famous sheet with five caricatured heads. The types and the forms are Leonardesque enough. The pen-stroke goes from left to right. But there is a hardness in the touch, and a machine-like precision in the line which can scarcely be the master's, and in all probability betray the clever copyist. At Windsor there is a pen-drawing for the Madonna with the Child fondling a cat, where again the types and the direction of the stroke are irreproachable. The quality however is not Leonardo's.† At

\* This was first systematically expounded by Morelli.

† At the bottom of this sketch occurs the motive, twice painted by Oggiono, of the two Holy Children embracing.



Windsor again there is a study in red chalk [No. 37] of an old man in profile to right, seated. Here also all but the quality is Leonardo's. The Royal Library at Turin has another version of the same original, equally faithful to the stroke, but equally devoid of Leonardo's quality. By some such imitator again must be the puzzling sheet in the Venice Academy. It is in red chalk and contains studies which, if they were Leonardo's own, would have to be considered as being for the Madonna with St. Anne: two of the Child, one of His head, two arms, a leg, and a nude torso for the Virgin. Here are Leonardo's types, materials, and stroke. At the top there is even a word in what I take to be his own handwriting. Yet I cannot so far abandon my sense of quality as to believe that this is the drawing of a great artist.

### III

Leonardo's earliest dated sketch is the landscape in the Uffizi inscribed with his own hand, "Aug. 5, 1473." It is a note taken on a walk, perhaps in some outlying nook of the Valdarno. It is individualised, and is persuasively true to its topography in a way that, so far as we know, no Italian work of this kind had been hitherto; and it has been done with almost a Japanese lightness of touch. The pen has been lifted from the paper as seldom as possible. The next in date, from the autumn of 1478, is in the Uffizi again, and once more a pen-sketch, representing the bust of an old man in profile to right, and facing him the head of a youth. Here we already meet with Leonardo's matured manner of drawing. The line is straggling, careless you would say, yet everywhere and always significant and functional. Note what a quality of modelling Leonardo gets with mere ink. Here, as in those wonderful heads which fill the Adoration, you are made to realise the fine articulations, the delicate structure of the cranium, and the firm stretching over it of the skin.

The old man's profile, which we have just examined, enables us to date a large number of Leonardo's other drawings. At Windsor there is a series of sketches chiefly of profiles, which to judge by the line and the modelling must have left Leonardo's hand at just about the same time. Most noteworthy is a sheet containing eleven profiles, three of young women, the rest of men. The same scrawls of lines, the same splendid modelling as in the Uffizi drawing. The profiles of the young women, frank and robust, in their turn witness to the relatively early date of this series, for these profiles, in their outlines and proportions vividly recall such an one of Pollajuolo's as that in the Hainauer Collection at Berlin, and more still the one (which I have many reasons for ascribing to Verrocchio) in the Poldi-Pezzoli Museum at Milan.

But it is not so much my intention to insist upon these heads as upon the sketch for a Madonna on the other side of the same sheet. She sits gracefully and easily holding the Child to her breast while the infant Baptist looks

up to them both with profound devotion. All that is best and noblest in Raphael's Madonnas is here already—and be it noted Raphael was not yet born—an equal charm of pose and composition, and a beauty at least as refined. Now if this Madonna dates from about 1478,\* it follows that a number of kindred sketches could not have been drawn much later. I refer in the first place to other studies for the Madonna, most of them for a Madonna with the Child fondling a kitten. Several of them are in the British Museum, and the ablest and most interesting is a sheet containing two studies for the Madonna with the Child at her breast fondling a kitten, three of the Child with the kitten, and one of a youthful profile. This profile is identical with more than one on the Windsor sheet containing the Madonna, and there is no lack of other evidence that the two sheets are of about the same date. The lines and the shading are the same, and the short-hand indications peculiar to each draughtsman and varying with his advancing years are the same, and identical also is the essential action in each. But in the sketch at the British Museum, the action is already very expressive, anticipating such Madonnas of Leonardo's Milanese followers as Solario's "*Vierge au cousin vert*." The finest by far of all the drawings for a "*Madonna del Gatto*" is the noble sketch in the Uffizi [Plate xcix.],† of the same early date certainly, as is proved by the drawing of the bust and arms and hand, but with the added mystery, subtlety and majesty of Leonardo's most haunting types of women. And along with these we must place the most magnificent of all Leonardo's studies for the Madonna, the one in the His de la Salle Collection at the Louvre [Plate c.]. In type the Virgin here has considerable resemblance to the one in the Uffizi which we have just noticed, but even more to the head of the Madonna in the unfinished painting of the Adoration. The action of the Child, who here is fondling His mother's cheek with His right hand, while He puts His left into a dish of fruit which she holds, is almost the same as in the British Museum drawing that we have examined, and in the Madonna at Windsor. But the conception is larger, and the drawing is of a freedom which I venture to believe has never been surpassed. It rivals the feats of the great artists of the Farthest East who prided themselves on producing their effect with the fewest strokes, and those with the utmost rapidity. Here certainly there has been no dawdling; what the mind perceived, that the hand unhesitatingly, unfalteringly executed. It is perhaps as near an approach to the actual transfer to paper of a visual thought as man has ever achieved.

## IV

The various drawings still remaining for Leonardo's unfinished Adoration of the Magi closely connect themselves in point of date with those which we have

\* The Uffizi head, by the way, with which I connect all these other drawings is accompanied by the words: *bre 1478 inchominciai le 2 Vgine Marie*. "In September 1478 I began the two Madonnas."

† Morelli went most signally astray in failing to perceive Leonardo's hand here, ascribing it to that fetching Lombard, Sodoma.

been studying hitherto. A sheet in the British Museum with sketches for the old man in the foreground on the left, contains also a profile drawn precisely as the one of 1478 at the Uffizi. M. Bonnat has a leaf whereon are drawn various nudes for the background, but also a young woman in profile kneeling who has every resemblance, both as type and as drawing, to the profile at Windsor. In the Galichon sketch at the Louvre for the entire composition [Plate ci.], the Child is identical with the one in the British Museum drawing for a "Madonna del Gatto." The shading is done as much as possible with the pen not lifted from the paper, as in the landscape of 1473.

Certain writers have of late been expressing a doubt as to the date of the Adoration,\* and would declare either that it was a work executed altogether in the sixteenth century, or that at all events the Madonna was then inserted. As there is some danger that in the starless sky of art-study people who have as yet discovered no compass to guide them will listen to the first voice they hear in the dark, it is worth while to lend them a hand, helping them to a proper decision regarding a point so vital as the date of the Adoration. It will be the affair of but a word or two.

The few drawings for this composition which we already have noted are obviously early, and of the kind of Leonardo's other early sketches. Turning now to the painting itself, we surely cannot help observing that all the old men's skulls and faces are drawn and modelled as the profiles in the Uffizi and Windsor, with the same deep-set eyes, and the same delicate structure of the cranium. Under the tree on the right we descry a youth looking up in profile to the left, with his hand held up. One could almost believe that for this figure the scrawl of a young man's head on the Uffizi drawing dated 1478 served as a sketch. But there are such as will grant that the rest of the picture is early, provided you allow that the Madonna was added later. No doubt can be permitted, however, that the Madonna in the Adoration, who is almost identical in every detail of type and feature with the drawings of the Madonna in the His de la Salle Collection and at the Uffizi, must be of the same date as these, and therefore an early work. Note, moreover, the amazing likeness between the right forearm and hand in the Uffizi sketch and those in the painted Madonna. The whole of the Adoration, then, as is demonstrated by internal evidence, is an early work. Its exact date must be decided by documents, and as there is every probability in Milanese's suggestion that the Adoration was the picture referred to in a document he published, we can safely assume that the date of that document, 1481, gives us the date of the masterpiece.†

\* Strzygowski in *Jahrb. Pr. Kstsmg.* xvi. p. 159 *et seq.*

† It does not follow, therefore, that Leonardo never thought of painting this subject before this date. As we already have seen, there is every probability that some of the sketches for an Adoration were made in 1478, and others may be earlier still. Leonardo, moreover, was an artist who, as no other, regarded his art abstractly. The future author of the "Treatise on Painting" must have spent much time from his earliest active years thinking how so important a theme as the Epiphany should be treated—the more so as it was a theme which, as few, could give scope to his genius.



To return to the various studies that may have been made in connection with this work, we must first mention a sketch of kindred subject, in the collection of M. Bonnat [Plate cii.]. It is for the Adoration of the Shepherds, a drawing of matchless rhythm as a composition, and of the exact species both in the types and in the handling as the various studies for the Epiphany. One might suppose, therefore, that Leonardo at first was uncertain whether he was to paint an Adoration of the Magi or of the Shepherds; but the more probable explanation of this sketch is that, like some of those for the Epiphany, it was made with no actual commission in view. The same opinion would hold true of the small Nativity at Windsor, and yet another drawing there of this subject, as well as of a third with angels in the air, at Venice—that they also were done as exercises in composition. But whether drawn before or after receiving the commission for the Epiphany, the Louvre design which I already have mentioned, foreshadows the picture that Leonardo commenced. Compared with the painting, the sketch is simpler, more traditional, far less majestic, and with but small foreshadowing of the feeling conveyed by the panel, that we are in the presence of a mystery which all that was wisest and noblest on earth had gathered, awe-struck, to worship. The study is scarcely more than a mapping out of the design, but every line vibrates with Leonardo's intimate charm. Wholly banished from the picture, the traditional shed under which the Madonna sits still lingers on (as if even Leonardo found its riddance difficult) in the splendid sketch in the Uffizi, representing the background of this same composition [Plate ciii.]. This sheet is at once a subtly elaborated study of perspective such as Uccello or Piero dei Franceschi might have done, and of man and beast hurrying to and fro. The remaining sketches for this composition have nothing to teach us. The finest of them (in the Malcolm Collection) contains two men conversing, and a draped figure blowing a trumpet into the ear of a nude. The study belonging to M. Valton of Paris is only less excellent.

V

It will have been observed that most of the drawings which we have studied thus far are rapid notes with the pen; and I venture to suggest that of this kind was the bulk of the drawings executed by Leonardo before he left Florence.

for action and composition. We shall see presently that he did not wait for a commission to make studies for certain subjects; for on the back of one of these sketches for the Adoration, Leonardo already drew a study for a Last Supper, fifteen years at least before he got the order for his fresco.

If this be so, if years before undertaking to paint an Adoration, Leonardo had spent thought upon the subject and made studies for it, it becomes more than probable that Botticelli while painting his Adoration—the one with the Medici portraits, now in the Uffizi—was influenced by Leonardo, despite the fact that his picture was painted earlier.

At all events, this panel of Sandro's has points in common with Leonardo's unfinished work—none so striking, however, as the fact that in each of the paintings a figure in the lower right hand corner, heedless of dramatic propriety, looks away from the event depicted. These figures resemble one another still farther: their action and their drapery is singularly alike. Now in the one case we know for a certainty that this figure is Botticelli's portrait of himself. Does it not follow that in the other we probably have a portrait of Leonardo by himself?

That he used other materials at this period is obvious, but not so markedly as later. It is curious, for instance, that not one pen-sketch remains for the "*Vierge aux Rochers*." The intelligent student can appreciate how interesting it would be to get a glimpse into Leonardo's mind while it was evolving a composition of such truly epoch-making originality. That Leonardo passed many visions through his mind, and from his mind to paper, our acquaintance with the various stages of the Adoration allows us to assume. But of all this mental and manual activity no trace remains. The only drawings which we may connect with this Virgin of the Rocks are all studies of single details, and none of the entire composition. These drawings, but three in number, are all of most elaborate finish. The head in silver-point of a young woman at Turin, a study, as Dr. Richter well perceived, for the angel, is one of the finest achievements of all draughtsmanship. I know not which gives me the greater pleasure, whether the quality of the contours, or the exquisite firmness of the modelling; whether the enigmatic beauty of the conception, or the apparent effortlessness of the execution. Far below this is the red chalk study at Windsor for the Child's head.\* The remaining sketch, also at Windsor, done with the brush in bistre on greenish paper and heightened with white, is one of those marvellously elaborated studies of drapery which Leonardo, and he alone, knew how to produce. I shall have a word to say about it later. Meanwhile, it should be noted that, as Dr. Richter points out, this study for the drapery of the angel has more resemblance to the National Gallery copy, made, as we now know, under Leonardo's superintendence, by Ambrogio da Predis, than to the original. It would leave as alternatives either that Ambrogio, using this sketch to help him interpret the original, ended by following it mechanically, or that Leonardo made this drawing on purpose, knowing perchance that the copyist would find it more within his powers, than the subtly swung lines of his own painting.

## VI

I have no new theory regarding the Sforza monument, and I will not waste space in recounting what the student will find in Richter, Müller-Walde, and others. But while we examine one or two of the many sketches that are brought into connection with this undertaking, for their quality as draughtsmanship, we may at the same time take a glance at other studies by Leonardo of the horse, with or without his rider.

The various studies for the Sforza monument may be divided into two classes:† those which represent the horse at a gallop or careering, and those where he is walking quietly. Now while the latter obviously is the action best suited for massive and colossal sculpture, the violent action will call out more from

\* The head in the Louvre for the St. John retains so little of Leonardo's own work that I prefer not to speak of it.

† This was clearly perceived for the first time by M. Courajod, I believe.

the draughtsman, particularly from a draughtsman such as Leonardo, master without a peer over form in movement. And so we find it. His sketches of the horse walking are, as drawing, relatively uninteresting, whereas among the others are some of Leonardo's most brilliant achievements. Perhaps the very finest are three sheets at Windsor, each in different materials. The one in pen and ink giving several sketches of the group of horse, rider, and prostrate foe all on top of an elaborate base, as well as of a horseman at gallop, is a most effortless and spontaneous jotting down of the inner vision. The sketch in silver-point on green paper [Plate civ.] of a nude clinging to the bare flanks of the horse as he gallops over the foe is the most chiselled in its effects, as if done in some metal or precious stone, yielding to the workman only after endless toil, and therefore the more exquisite. The finest plastic effect, the closest resemblance to the perfect bronze, we meet with in a study in black chalk on pinkish paper [Plate cv.], where the rider is about to smite the foe while passing over him—the group resting on a triumphal arch.

That the horse was Leonardo's life-long, loving study we have more than ample cause to believe. At Windsor there is the series of small drawings of the anatomy of the horse, each separate one a thing of beauty. A peculiarly fine example is a larger sheet in silver-point showing the whole creature in profile, and again his chest and legs. But it is the animal in action which most attracts me. Take such a study as the one in red chalk (at Windsor once more) with nude riders at full gallop, probably for an episode in the Battle of the Standard [photo. Braun 194], and note the soft evanescent effect as if in their swift course they soon would be out of sight even on the paper. Or again at Windsor see the sheet with the horses who, with their riders on their backs, are charging at dragons, or gambol and frolic and disport themselves as horses will when on breezy pastures, far from the bridle. The horse must have been much in Leonardo's mind to become, as it did, the sport of his caricaturing fancy. There is a sheet (at Windsor) with heads of horses, possessed—one must say—with a look bordering on the maniac.

## VII

At the Louvre, on the back of a sheet containing various figures for the Epiphany, there is a sketch drawn at the same time of six figures seated at a table. It is easy to dismiss them as having been designed for a party of carousing attendants in the background of the Adoration. That course, however, would be no less misleading than facile. The arrangement at the table, the eloquent gesture of the nude to whom the others are listening, can scarcely allow of a doubt but that the sketch was intended for a Last Supper, and that the moment chosen for representation is the moment when Christ announces that one of the disciples shall betray Him. But it would seem that Leonardo repented of the too eloquent



gesture of the Christ, and repented at once, for immediately below he sketched a figure more resigned, more hieratic, in short such an one as we deem more Christ-like.

It thus would seem that as early at least as 1481, Leonardo already was pondering over the problem how the Last Supper should be represented. This first sketch, however, neither permits us to see how he meant to articulate the composition, nor where he intended to place Judas and the beloved disciple. It is probable that Leonardo retained in his thought the conventional arrangement of all the figures, for we find them thus in a pen-sketch at Windsor, so different in technique from the early drawings that doubtless it was done when he already had the commission for the fresco at Milan. In this rapid but highly significant scrawl, we see Judas by himself facing the rest of the company, and, as if to leave no doubt regarding the John, Leonardo has sketched him separately with his face on the table, Christ's hand resting upon his shoulder. In the famous red chalk study at Venice both these conventional episodes still linger, although the grouping comes closer to the clear and rhythmic articulation of the finished work. It is thus certain that even a Leonardo, who, in composition at all events, was the most profoundly original of all Italian artists, emancipated himself from the formula of the schools then and then only when he was called upon to devote all the force of his mind to a subject. Until that time he also lingered in the old paths.

The other drawings for this great mural painting are, with one exception, for single heads. The least important is the Vienna bust, done with the pen and wash, of an old man with his right hand held up. If we compare it with the Venice sketch, it becomes probable that this head was intended for the Peter, although indeed there are certain things in the formation of the skull and in the modelling which tempt one to believe that this Albertina study was made at an earlier date than the work for S. Maria delle Grazie. In the fresco, in fact, it does not occur. The remaining heads are all at Windsor.\* For the Matthew there is the fine plastic head in red chalk—so full of antique inspiration as to suggest that Leonardo may have copied it from some Hellenistic original—which the painter changed but slightly while transferring it to the wall. Of this head then, at least, we can in our mind's eye see the pristine appearance. The even more powerful profile in the same material of an older person may possibly have been drawn by Leonardo for the Matthew, but it was not used. Another profile in black chalk [Plate cvii.], scarcely less antique than the first, bearing indeed a distinct resemblance to certain busts of Lucius Verus, must be regarded as a study for the apostle on the extreme left of the composition, and as an excellent representation of what the original must have been. For the Phillip there is a sketch in soft black chalk of a beautiful, gentle, sweet-hearted youth—a face we always should have in mind

\* The cartoons in coloured crayons at Weimar are not Leonardo's. I incline to the belief that they were done from the painting, by Solario, in preparation for his copy, happily still extant, and now exhibited along with the original.

when we look at this apostle's head in the painting [Plate cviii.]. For the Judas, finally, there are two sketches, both in red chalk, one done from the life, and another for the actual painting, the second unfortunately made over. For the Christ we have no study, unless indeed we count the head at the Brera, which no longer retains any perceptible trace of its author's hand.\*

## VIII

It is more than probable that for every considerable work at least Leonardo executed a cartoon. Only one remains, the famous one now in the Diploma Gallery of the Royal Academy [Plate cix.]. I will not go into the story of the origin and vicissitudes of this marvel, for I should find nothing to add to the masterly study which Mr. Herbert F. Cook has dedicated to this intricate subject.† Nor indeed can I hope to improve upon the subtle appreciation Mr. Cook has given of the intrinsic worth of this masterpiece. One will scarcely find draped figures conceived in more plastic fashion, unless one travels back through the centuries to those female figures that once sat together in the pediment of the Parthenon. In Italian art we shall discover nowhere else a modelling at once so firm and so supple, so delicate and so large, as that of the Virgin's head and bust here. We should look in vain also for draperies which, while revealing to perfection the form and movement of the parts they cover, are yet treated so unacademically, are yet so much actual clothing that you can think away.

Although we are in the presence of a cartoon as elaborated, for all we know, as any that Leonardo ever executed, we see no such attempts as other Florentines made at high finish for its own sake. The artist treats it as work merely preparatory, as he seems to have treated all the rest of his drawings. The chalks have evidently been used with the greatest rapidity, and for the mere drawing he was contented with little more than the outlines. The modelling it was which chiefly absorbed his attention, and he seems to have carried it as far as his materials would permit, seeking in even the preparatory stages that completely realised relief which caused him to dwell for years upon the painting of a picture.

The only sketch known to me for the entire cartoon is the scrawl in the British Museum, which reveals a stage no doubt earlier in the evolution of the composition, but far too close to the final version to betray the form it may have first taken in Leonardo's mind. Somewhat more may be inferred from the not too well preserved, but most beautiful head in red and black chalk at Windsor for the St. Anne, from which it would appear that the artist's earlier idea was to make her look on in calm contemplation, with more of Mona Lisa's expression, and not as in the cartoon, where she turns to the Virgin with a joy almost too eager. It

\* At Windsor there is a sketch for the drapery of Peter's arm, of which I shall speak in another connection.

† Gazette des Beaux Arts, Nov. 1897.

would follow then that in the painting Leonardo returned to an earlier idea, for on the whole the sentiment of the St. Anne there has more kinship with the Windsor head.

Why Leonardo deserted this cartoon to engage upon another version of the same subject (on which he was working at Florence in 1501) it would be hard to determine. Certain reasons, however, may be suggested: as that the first cartoon lacked in clearness of arrangement, or that the painter was so enamoured of a pyramidal grouping, that ultimately he could not remain contented with another. Symbolism also may have had its part in the change, for, to judge by his writings, no great artist delighted more in allegorical fancy and representation than he. In the Venice Academy there is a sketch—one of his finest pen-drawings—for the altered version [Plate cx.]. Here Leonardo was still undecided just how to arrange the heads, and it had not yet occurred to him to make the Virgin bend down in such a way that her head would come under her mother's. What searchings must he not have gone through before he attained to the perfectly proportioned grouping, the exquisite balance of masses, the harmonious rhythm of expression rippling from face to face, that we admire in the great picture at the Louvre!

There are a number of studies (with two exceptions all at Windsor) for separate parts of this great work, or, to be accurate, for the cartoon after which it was painted. For the St. Anne there is a head, in black chalk, of endless charm, but somewhat less subtle in expression, and demanding in the figure more action than we find in the picture. Mr. Mond recently acquired at the Warwick sale that triumph of modelling with chalk, the head for the Virgin. The expression is sweeter, more lovely than in the painting, which, it must be borne in mind, is not quite finished. For the torso of the Child reaching out with His little arms, there is a sketch in dark red chalk. The remaining studies for this work are all of draperies, four or five at Windsor, and one in Paris.

We may take this occasion for a bare word about Leonardo's studies for draperies; and as typical examples let us choose the one at Windsor for the kneeling angel in the "*Vierge aux Rochers*," another at Windsor for the arm of Peter in the Last Supper, and for a third the drapery for the lower part of the Virgin in the Madonna with St. Anne [Plate cxi.]. In the first of these, as in a sense in all of Leonardo's draperies, we readily discern the follower of Verrocchio.\* But while retaining a preference for a system of detailed, crumpled, or plaited folds, Leonardo has cast off the uncouth blanket-like stuffs, and gives instead textures which lend themselves more readily to the task of draping the figure while at the same time revealing its form and action. Leonardo was perhaps the first modern artist who treated drapery neither as mere calligraphy or ornament on the one hand, nor on the other hand as a mere scheme for the majestic and even monumental rendering of the figure. Leonardo's draperies are real tissues made up as real

\* An early study in the Louvre [No. 389] is so close to Verrocchio that but for the quality it might almost as well be Credi's as Leonardo's [Plate cxii.].



clothing, as real as any we wear to-day. His triumph is that despite the realism, and despite the greater homeliness, he, none the less, makes the figures exist for us, under their relatively modern garb, as much as any of Giotto's or Masaccio's majestic apparitions—more perhaps than any of Michelangelo's. Note in the study for Peter's arm what an effect is produced by the many folds ;—while the modelling of the limb is scrupulously regarded, the crumplings and plaitings produce all the difference that fluting gives to a Dorian column. The Louvre study has unhappily been more than a little worked over, and yet with that indestructibility of a thing originally great, it still remains an example of how texture may so be wedded to form that the one gains in distinction and grace from the other.\* And in the centuries that have passed since Leonardo, how few artists have understood drapery as he ! I am at a loss to name more than one, but that one by a singular coincidence resembles Leonardo in his command also of form in action. I mean Degas.†

## IX

Early in 1500, passing through Mantua, Leonardo took a portrait in crayons of the famous Isabella d'Este. It would appear from a letter written by her a year later‡ that Leonardo had made two copies of the sketch, one of which he left with the Marchioness, while another was to serve him as the cartoon for a picture. Happily it is more than probable that one of these versions has escaped destruction, and that the splendid cartoon in the Louvre for the profile head of a lady is nothing less than the one for the portrait of Isabella d'Este. As it is carefully pricked for transfer, we may assume that it was the version which Leonardo took with him.

The head in sharp profile to right rests on a bust which only partially follows the same direction. The hands are crossed. The hair, confined in a net, is massed around the face and falls low down on the neck. The dress is striped. The condition of the cartoon might be much more satisfactory, but it still reveals the hand of the supreme artist. A lady of great distinction and fine presence, she looks out simply and unconsciously, with little or none of the enigmatical, unfathomable expression of the Mona Lisa. The master evidently made faithful record here of the vision that presented itself through his eyes to his mind, and did not even attempt to make it body forth, as in the Gioconda, some dream nurtured through a life-time. But it is much more than the portrait merely. Its purely artistic merits are of the highest order. The workmanship shares in directness with the conception, and the whole cartoon was probably the labour of one sitting. Leonardo's never-failing readiness as a draughtsman doubtless

\* Here also we have a study for the cartoon rather than the painting, which in the corresponding parts is unfinished.

† See, for instance, the studies of draperies so amazingly Leonardesque in "Degas, Vingt Dessins," Paris, Goupil.

‡ "Archivio Storico dell'Arte," 1888, p. 45.

attended him here. With rapid contours he not only renders the outlines but the modelling of a face, the subtle proportions of which are just beginning to be marred by flesh. This, in its turn, is beautifully treated and highly finished. All else, as the hair and the dress, are duly subordinated by a more sketchy execution, which yet never lacks a specific, decorative quality of its own.

No trace, however slight, remains of any work preparatory to the Gioconda, but a cartoon at Chantilly may be mentioned in this connection. It is Mona Lisa nude and translated into Lombard. Who this translator may have been I have no idea—Melzi or Salai, or what not. The question of interest is whether the author of this cartoon stripped for himself Leonardo's exquisitely draped figure, or whether he did no more than trace a special cartoon by the master. In the latter case, the head surely would have been more worthy of Leonardo. But the hands are too close to this artist's way of drawing to have been taken from anything but a sketch by him. It must, moreover, be remembered that besides this cartoon there exist at least two paintings\* of the same subject, one at the Hermitage and another belonging to Lord Spencer, each independent of the cartoon, and by a separate hand. All these considerations would point to the existence of a cartoon for this figure by Leonardo himself, of which the one at Chantilly is the closest extant representative.

And at this point it will be well to look at a few other drawings of heads by Leonardo, some of them doubtless for portraits. An early one is at Windsor, the more than half-length profile in black and red chalk of a young woman, erect, robust, next-of-kin in spirit to the famous profile in the Poldi Pezzoli Museum at Milan, which I would ascribe to Verrocchio. Another profile also at Windsor, in silver-point, on a larger scale, is of a somewhat older woman, although still a young matron [Plate cxiii.]. The workmanship has much in common with that of the fine head at Turin for the angel in the "Vierge aux Rochers;" but the simple pose, and the noble conception already anticipate the cartoon of Isabella d'Este. Then there is in the Malcolm Collection the marvellous bust in profile of a warrior in fanciful armour and helmet [Plate cxiv.], a profile reminding us vividly of a head in Verrocchio's Decapitation of the Baptist in the silver altar at Florence, and not a little also of the potent Pollajuolesque engravings known as "il gran Turco," but more abundantly alive, more imbued with the *condottiere* spirit than either. Less truculent in mood, but scarcely less vigorous in conception, are such profiles, again, as that of a laurel-crowned old man at Turin, or of an old man at Windsor resembling Leonardo himself, with a long beard floating soft as down. But the boldest of all, and as execution among the most brilliant is the head of a gipsy, probably Vasari's Scaramuccia, at Christ Church, Oxford. Here the black chalk is used with a freedom, with a decorative beauty for which we shall find parallels nowhere but among Dürer's heads done in the same materials. Such a treatment of the hair, making each curl instinct with life, as if it were a Medusa's lock,

\* I have distinct remembrance of a third at the exhibition of old masters at Bologna in 1888.

is a trait almost peculiar to Leonardo. We meet with it throughout his career in heads so early as those in the red chalk sketch in the Uffizi, or so late as those quasi-antique profiles at Windsor for the Last Supper.

## X

The Battle of the Standard has met with such lucid treatment at the hands of Dr. Richter\* that I find but little to change and as little to add. To the various versions mentioned by him as copies after the chief episode in this famous composition, I would, however, add one more. It is much larger than the others, is on canvas, and if one may base a judgment upon its scheme of colour, and certain minutiae, I should take it to be a copy made in the later decades of the sixteenth century after a copy made by Sodoma from the original.† If my conjecture be well founded, then this version—belonging to Mr. Herbert P. Horne—is by far the most important now remaining, for it is larger and clearer than any other, and represents a copy made as early probably as any, Raphael's slight sketch excepted. Then it is worth while insisting, as has not yet been done, on the essential agreement of all the various versions. Not to speak of such as Rubens' drawing, which of course could not have been taken from the original, the two versions already mentioned, the one in the collection of the late M. Charles Timball, and the other in the magazine of the Uffizi, seem to be independent transcripts from Leonardo's painting, and differ from each other in slight details only. The Uffizi version, the painting of which is still close to the living Raphaellesque tradition—indeed I would hazard ascribing it to Raffaello del Colle—is peculiarly interesting for those parts which are unfinished. One who has carefully studied Leonardo's St. Jerome, or Adoration, or St. Anne will scarcely fail to recognise that the unfinished parts in the Uffizi version are singularly like unfinished parts in those compositions—for even here, in what a given master will leave to the last, and how he will leave it, habit prevails—and the conclusion is not to be avoided that this version reveals the state in which Leonardo left his painting.

What the chief episode in the Battle of Anghiari, the only episode in all probability which Leonardo actually painted, was like, we thus know precisely and adequately, but we can frame no such idea of the cartoon as a whole—indeed we do not even know that the cartoon as a whole ever existed. It is true that from Leonardo's writings and from various sketches at the British Museum, at Windsor and in Venice—sketches of nudes and charging horsemen massed in fiery onset—we may derive some notion of what he had in mind, but it must remain vague.

For the principal episode, then, we have several studies of heads. At Buda-

\* "The Literary Works of Leonardo," i. pp. 335-340.

† The fact seems to have escaped notice that the spirit of Leonardo's composition inspired no other extant painting so much as the fresco at Monteliveto Maggiore by Sodoma, representing Totila's attack on Monte Cassino.



Pesth there is one sheet in black chalk containing drawings for the head of the warrior (who in the painting looks younger) facing to right, brandishing a scimitar, and a less finished sketch for the older man facing him [Plate cxv.], both marvellous specimens of ready, vigorous draughtsmanship; and yet another sheet in red chalk [Plate cxvi.] with the profile of a beautiful long-necked youth—surely Michelangelo must have had this creation of his hated rival in mind when painting his youths on the Sixtine ceiling—who served for the figure to the extreme right of the composition. On the back of the first drawing is the study of a head for a standard-bearer. At Windsor there is yet another head, certainly for this battle, as vehement, as intent as any, but perhaps surpassing all for the way the massive clustering hair is rendered with only three or four chalk marks [Plate cxvii.].\*

## XI

For Antonio Segni, as Vasari tells us, Leonardo drew a cartoon representing Neptune “riding over the foaming sea on a chariot harnessed to sea-horses, in the midst of monsters and marine deities.” A happy chance has preserved the sketch—it is in red chalk, at Windsor—for the principal part of the composition [Plate cxviii.]. We see the Earth-Shaker apparently kneeling as he holds the reins tight with his left hand, and plunges his trident at one of the wildest steeds. It is a superb piece of pure decoration, the slim, serpentine sea-forms careering and gliding, tossing and whirling over the churned foam, while the Herculean god gathers their motion into a rhythmic dance about him.

The various copies still existing of a nude Leda fondling the swan while she glances down, smiling, at her two babes, postulate a common source, an original from which they all were derived. The most interesting of these versions is the one in the collection of the Baronne de Ruble† (Paris), where we can distinctly discern in the forms and structure that Leonardo’s original, which, but for quality, could have been at no appreciable remove from this copy, must have been a work of his later years. It is, of course, a question as yet undecided whether the master ever went so far as actually to paint his Leda. With his own hands he may never have carried it farther than to a cartoon. Even this has now disappeared, although it is possible that it existed until so late as 1721 when Edward Wright‡ saw a cartoon of “a Leda standing naked, with Cupids in one of the corners at the bottom” in the collection of the Marquis Casendi at Milan.

For this standing version of the Leda there is in the Codice Atlantico an

\* A profile in black chalk of an old man at the Venice Academy is of inferior quality and does not quite convince me of its authenticity. If really Leonardo’s, as is probable, it served for the head between the two who brandish their swords.

† The one in the Borghese Gallery, being a copy after a version by Sodoma, is so much the farther removed from Leonardo.

‡ “Some Observations made in travelling through France and Italy.”

indication, not an inch high, yet giving the arrangement and action of the whole figure,\* while at Windsor there are four studies for her head and hair. The face is one of Leonardo's loveliest, yet the artist was not thinking of that but of the arrangement of the hair. He elaborates it with the more than maze-like inextricability, but also with even more than the beauty of those knots known as his Academy. And still each lock is like a lightning flash.

Another treatment of this subject certainly suggested itself to Leonardo, for at Windsor there are on the same sheet two studies [Plate cxix.], obviously from his later years, for a Leda half-kneeling and toying with her babes.† One of these is for its scale the finest, yes the finest nude in the whole of Italian draughtsmanship. How the firmness and fulness of the shapely body are realised, with touches how few and how telling!

In an inventory of drawings and paintings in his studio made while in Milan‡ Leonardo speaks of "eight St. Sebastians." This is ample witness to the interest the subject had for him, although there is no trace of evidence that he ever painted it. Four slight sketches for it still remain, one in the Ambrosiana,§ another at Windsor, the third at Hamburg, and the fourth in the collection of M. Bonnat. It would seem that Sodoma was acquainted with the last, for his famous St. Sebastian has nearly the same action and expression.

## XII

The readers of Leonardo's writings will have been struck by the numerous passages describing or noting the parallelisms between the nature of animals or plants and human conduct. These are but an outcome of the tendency in certain minds at all times, but more prevalent during half barbarous ages, to find in simple things, and in visual signs, symbols of high import, and allegories referring to human destiny. In no other respect was Leonardo so mediæval, and this trait of his mind, more or less common to all men at his time—this continuous fixing of the attention upon some visual object, this weaving of fancy and conjecture and yearning about it until around it the thread-work of a man's whole thought has been twined—was in Leonardo's case much aided and enhanced by his determined preference for visual rather than verbal notation, or, at least for the one as the unfailing illustration to the other, where the visual form alone would not suffice.

Thus we have numerous drawings from Leonardo's hand, varying in size from mere cameo sketches to the full page, and in clearness from some obvious figurative

\* First noted and published by Müller-Walde. "Jahr. Preuss. Kstsmg." xviii. 137.

† A painting, connected, however, remotely with this sketch, seems to have formed part of the Malmaison Collection. Müntz, "Léonard de Vinci," p. 430 note. If M. Müntz had been acquainted with the sketch we are now discussing he might have hesitated before writing: "For my part I am decided: the moment the mother of Castor and Pollux is on her knees, she has nothing to do with the Leda of Leonardo."

‡ Richter, paragr. 680.

§ Reproduced in "Jahr. Kstsmg." xix. p. 260.

action to allegories so elaborate that I for one cannot hope to divine their import. Not that from my point of view it matters greatly; for surely even where the subject is obscure, and its meaning unfathomable, the specifically artistic elements—all that we here are concerned with—lose nothing of their sovereign beauty. One instance will reveal how difficult it is for us nowadays to penetrate the mind of Leonardo while he was sketching certain of his allegories. At the British Museum there is a pen-drawing from his earlier years, one of his most exquisite, where we see a maiden with a unicorn nestling by her. The suggestion to us is one of such refinement and purity that we can think of no more apt illustration for some Spenserian allegory of Chastity—and indeed even in Leonardo's time the unicorn was the almost universal symbol of this Virtue. But read this out of his *Bestiary*:\* “Incontinence. The unicorn is so incontinent and unable to control his love for young girls that forgetting his native wildness and shyness, he goes up fearlessly to any damsel he finds seated, and falls asleep in her lap. It is thus that the huntsmen take him.”

With this as a warning, I shall not venture to give too close an interpretation of Leonardo's allegories. What may be the meaning of the beautiful pen-drawing at Christ Church, Oxford? We see a young woman seated on a cage full of hissing serpents at whom dogs are jumping, egged on by a satyr and angel, while she brandishes lightning—or what?—at them. But behold, in place of a back to her head there grows another face, and as if to make her aware of it, a lovely creature sitting close by her holds up a mirror. Again, who shall interpret the dainty drawing at the Louvre where a youth mirrors the sun while all sorts of beasts devour each other [Plate cxx.]? Others happily have text to explain them, as at Christ Church the allegories of Pleasure and Pain, or the fascinating one of Envy—this a subject to which, poor man, Leonardo returned frequently.

At Windsor there is a design in red chalk [Plate cxxii.]. A light skiff plunges away from a rocky coast over the stormy sea toward a globe whereon perches a noble eagle. A spreading tree is the mast, and in the stern sits a wolf carefully guiding its course toward the eagle. Here the allegory is obvious. The eagle with the crown hovering over him perched on a globe, which clearly is the earth, represents Empire. The wolf is notoriously the Church. The rest follows. But what a beautiful drawing it is! How the waves and the churned-up foam are rendered, how the width of the sea is suggested, what scorn in the eagle! In such a drawing, on the other hand, as the bold, dashing bistre-sketch in the Malcolm Collection, we are scarcely any longer in the realm of symbolism. It is a plain representation of Victory [Plate cxxi.]. But what loveliness of the nude and what action! And this reminds me that nowhere as in these subjects is there such close parallelism between Leonardo and his not unworthy contemporary, Sandro Botticelli. We cannot help recalling the latter's *Calumny*, and certain pages of his illustrations to the last cantos of the “*Purgatorio*.” Note especially in this connection

\* Richter, paragr. 1232.



the allegory of a triumphal car and small figures at Windsor, and there also the beautiful woman pointing—so like Sandro's Beatrice.

## XIII

What Leonardo was as a draughtsman we have seen, as we studied those of his sketches that we examined in connection with paintings which he actually executed, or at the least planned. We should learn little more by devoting much time to his numerous other drawings, pleasant though the task would be. Yet a few more may be mentioned before we leave this sovereign genius for his more Titanic rival.

At Windsor there is a study in black chalk [Plate cxxiii.] of an alert, robust youth, swinging along lightly in his march, arm akimbo, and lance in hand, as fresh and delightful a vision as is Quentin Durward on his first walk to the castle of Amboise. A kindred creation is the sketch, at Windsor also, of an Amazonian creature in corselet of chain mail. Scarcely less beautiful in themselves, and more wonderful in draughtsmanship, are a number of nudes, chiefly at Windsor, studies in anatomy and physiology, but of exquisite artistic value. They are as firm as bronze, yet with all the elasticity and roundness of real muscle and flesh—studies far more complete than any of his precursor's, Pollajuolo's, and at the same time far more plastically real, far more essentially true than any of Michelangelo's nudes. In this connection note also the study [Plate cxxiv.] at Windsor of hands, bony, yet delicate—not for the Gioconda, by the way. Or again those sections of skulls which more than justify Leonardo's boast that with the aid of his sketches anatomy might be studied without the skeleton.

In the allegory of the Papacy and Dominion, we already have seen an admirable specimen of Leonardo's landscapes, at once evocative and suggestive, yet decorative. In the others, whether of landscapes in calm, or with storms raging over them, we find the same poetic force, the same decorative beauty. The clouds and the water are dealt with as he dealt with human hair, and indeed with the same vivifying touch that he gave to plants in his many studies for botany.

And his drawings of various occupations merit special attention. Look at the soft sketch at Windsor of people ploughing and sowing, or there also that marvellous scene of action, the courtyard of an arsenal with nude labourers hoisting a cannon. Here you have the most exquisite precision of geometrical drawing contrasted with nearly all the possible attitudes of the living man. What a life-enhancing spectacle for us who merely watch and skim the pleasure off this concert of vigorous movements! More delightful still is the enchanting fragment at Venice of three maidens dancing [Plate cxxv.]. Their draperies dance with them. You hear the sounds that strike their ears. In a moment the contagion will seize you. You will have to join them.

## XIV

I shall not speak of the many drawings the bulk of which still pass under Leonardo's own name, executed by his followers. My reasons are simple and sufficient. These followers were almost without exception not Florentines but Milanese, and my present task is confined to painters who were reared not only on Florentine art but in Florence. Yet I regret this limitation. Could I but treat of these followers here I should perhaps end by persuading others, as I have been obliged to persuade myself, that it is scarcely more correct to speak of a Milanese than of a Roman school of painting. There was such a thing as an Umbro-Florentine school located in Rome, and there was such a thing as a Padua-Florentine school located in Milan ; but deduct from Milan the influence first of Foppa and then of Leonardo, and you have left very much such a school as Rome would have had without the Umbrians and Florentines who worked there.

## CHAPTER IX

### MICHELANGELO

**I**N this chapter it is not my intention to give much space to questions of authenticity, nor to dwell at length on the merits of the individual sketches which we shall have occasion to discuss. Both these themes will be found treated in the appended catalogue of Michelangelo's drawings. I will not even inflict on the student—that special student whom alone I can expect to follow me or indeed to be interested in my researches—upon this student I will not impose a rhetorical exercise in the form of a rounded panegyric on the great Buonarroti as a draughtsman. A word or two here and there shall suffice. My purpose is rather to kindle, out of such of his drawings as I have been able to discover, whatever light I, with my limited ability, can make them yield for the purpose of illuminating his career as an artist. His drawings shall serve to help us understand the genesis of his various works, to supplement our knowledge of those which have remained incomplete or have utterly perished, and perhaps to give us, at moments, flashes of insight into his mind and the ideas that possessed or haunted it.

We should never forget, however, that but a portion, and no great portion, of Michelangelo's designs has weathered the centuries. Although so prodigal of his riches that even distant acquaintances did not hesitate to ask him for sketches to help out their poverty, he yet dreaded the notion of being robbed by those worst of great and petty thieves, the marauders of other people's goods on the highways of the mind; and while his notes existed he felt they were not safe from pilferers. Again, he was not free from a certain coquetry, and would not have it known, to use the phrase of Vasari, our informer, what hard hammer-strokes it took to bring forth Minerva from the head of Jove. The result was bonfire after bonfire, where many of the most precious of his labours disappeared. Later in life, when his sketches already had considerable market value, he gave away quantities to retainers who, like Mini, let themselves be wheedled out of them for a mere song, or otherwise scattered them to the four winds. Thus, in the inventory of Michelangelo's goods at his death, but few designs are found—and, indeed, the bulk, perhaps, of the Buonarroti Collection consists of drawings bought in the open



market by his grand-nephew. Thus we never can hope to know Michelangelo as God, as he himself, or as even his contemporaries knew him. That lopped and withered Michelangelo, whom his extant finished works present to us, we can, with the aid of his remaining drawings, endeavour to piece out and to quicken. But we must look forward to no conspicuous success, although the attempt is worth making.

## I

Michelangelo's favourite instrument, in his earlier years at all events, would seem to have been the pen. With it he could note down as in a flash, any idea that lightened through the thought-clouds of his mind. With it he could evoke upon the lifeless sheet before him all those delicate gradations and subtle planes necessary to the rendering of human form as he conceived it. And with it again, in vacant or listless mood, he would scribble down snatches from Petrarch, phrases from the prayer-book ; or he would even wander off to verse-making on his own account, thus rinsing himself clean of humours that versifying only could drain off. He would seem to have made less use of red chalk, even during youth and prime, while in old age he apparently seldom touched it. He does not seem to have loved it, although some of his very finest achievements are in this medium. Occasionally he seems to have forgotten that it was chalk and not a pen he was holding : so stringy and brittle is the effect. Black chalk Michelangelo at first may have used but sparingly, although not at all so sparingly as red, but as time went on he seems to have found it more and more convenient. With the advance of years, the love of the typical and essential so outweighed his earlier passion for the minute perfection of detailed form, that broad effects not only sufficed him, but grew to be his deliberate choice. And for this reason, perhaps, he appears, in his later years, to have discarded the pen as too delicate, and to have used for sketching nothing but black chalk. Even in his early manhood Michelangelo recurred to this medium when only the shape and action of a torso was his end. In his later years, when to him as an artist the torso, as a torso, was almost his one, only, and constant preoccupation, it may be imagined how dear soft black chalk became. There is yet a much employed instrument among Florentine draughtsmen which, in this connection, I have had no occasion to mention, the silver-point ; nor shall I need to speak of it here, for apparently Michelangelo never or almost never used it. This is not without its significance.

## II

Among Michelangelo's very earliest drawings are several after old masters. In the academy, wherein as a boy he was included by the magnificent Lorenzo, there

were "many drawings, cartoons, and models by Donatello, Brunellesco, Masaccio, Paolo Uccello, Fra Angelico, Fra Filippo, and many other artists both from at home and from abroad."\* We can never decide whether Michelangelo's copies were or were not made after these cartoons; but it was here, at the latest, that the growing boy got the impulse to study the old masters. Were we to make an inference from the sketches of this kind still extant, there would be small doubt that his favourite among his precursors was Masaccio. With but one exception, they all seem to me either after works by that hero of the arts, or at least to have been done under his overwhelming influence. The one exception also speaks well for the young Buonarroti's taste. Probably the earliest of all his remaining drawings [Louvre 1971] it shows us the youth copying faithfully, painstakingly, two figures out of Giotto's Ascension of St. John. It is not surprising that his figures are better articulated and have more vibration and tremor of life than the originals. So much we expect from a boy genius at the end of the Quattrocento. To me it is more remarkable that he has given these men all the corporeal existence, the full physical weight, the primeval sturdiness that Giotto imparted to them. Masaccio's original shines most luminously through the famous sketch at Vienna [S.R. 150], containing, on the one side, three standing figures of great dignity, and, on the other, a youth kneeling. I suspect that the standing figures, at least, were taken from the fresco representing the Consecration of the Carmine. A draped figure at Munich, less masterly and probably earlier, is clearly a copy after the Peter in Masaccio's Tribute Money. In the Teyler Museum at Haarlem there is a sheet [A. 18] on which is drawn on the front an elegant and majestic female saint, with the palms of her uplifted hands touching, as she addresses a male saint, while a youth kneels beside them in prayer. On the back is a draped young woman stooping as she walks forward. Here also the great dignity, the splendid form, the noble draperies leave in my mind little doubt that their inventor was Masaccio. Another distinctly Masacciesque figure is the lady in profile on the sheet at Chantilly. This leaf, one would be tempted to say, was done in the Medici gardens after the cartoons and casts and antiques there exposed: for beside the lady it has three studies after antique statues and one of a draped herma; but the freedom of the handling pleads for a somewhat later date. Finally we should mention perhaps the latest of this group, the seer or astrologer in the Malcolm Collection [No. 61, Plate cxxvi.]—a figure how different from the childish visions of a Maso Finiguerra for instance!—grand as if Masaccio's, yet probably showing not that master's invention so much as his fecundating inspiration.

More than fifty years later, catching at Vasari's a glimpse of some such sketch of his own as these we have just described, Michelangelo asserted that he had been a better draughtsman as a boy than at any subsequent period. One almost agrees with him. These first studies of his have a grandeur, a repose, and an impressiveness that we scarcely shall find him surpassing. He

\* Vasari, iv. 257.

renders the form with perfect precision under draperies which enhance as well as interpret it; and thus avoids what tended to be a defect in his later drawings of the nude, an over-insistence upon anatomical detail. All done with the pen, these earliest sketches are hatched with a delicate mesh of cross-lines which I almost could fancy to be a veil, believing that if I drew it away I should find not the blank sheet, but the nude itself. Curiously like his chisel-strokes are these pen-strokes. You will find the unfinished parts of the two tondi at the Bargello and at the London Royal Academy hatched, so to speak, in the same way. And yet another tale is told by this hatching. It bears witness to a fact that, somehow made bitter for him, Michelangelo later in life wished forgotten his apprenticeship under Domenico Ghirlandajo. Perhaps it was but the scorn of the eagle for the brood hen that had hatched him, and intolerable it surely must have been to hear the piping chicks claim kinship with him, and retrospective glory for their nest. But the pen-work in these early drawings, and indeed more than one trick of shorthand of later date, tell truthfully that Ghirlandajo was the man who first put a pen into Michelangelo's hand and taught him how to use it. The debt may be no greater than Dante's to his writing-master, but there it is. Yet it may well be greater; for as a draughtsman Domenico was far, very far indeed, from being the least among the artists of Florence.

### III

The earliest sketch by Michelangelo to which something like a precise date can be attached is the precious one in the Louvre for the bronze David—all the more precious for the fact that the finished work whose history, as is well known, can be followed down to the middle of the seventeenth century—has disappeared without leaving a trace. Although a small bronze, formerly in the Pulszky Collection and now at the Louvre, may be a somewhat confused echo of this work, and two other little bronzes, the first in the Royal Museum of Amsterdam and the second in the collection of Mr. Julius Wernher of London, may actually be casts of the original models, our only means of forming any precise idea of it is this drawing. We see the boy hero standing with the giant's head between his legs, his right foot resting firmly upon it, his left hand behind him, his right falling on his thigh, in an attitude of some fatigue, much contempt, and more indignation. There can be no doubt that Mr. Reiset\* was right in concluding that this was a sketch for the bronze David ordered of Michelangelo on August 12, 1502. He never undertook but two, this one, intended by the Signory for the Maréchal de Gié, and "the marble Giant." But it is inconceivable that any great sculptor could have intended for execution in colossal marble a figure so lacking in compactness, with the limbs so far apart, with so much of touch-and-go in the pose. For bronze the arrangement is just what it should be.

\* "Un Bronze de Michel-Ange," Paris, E. Thunot & Cie. 1853.



The same sheet contains a sketch for the left arm and shoulder of the marble David; but, except for the connoisseur, who will find it invaluable as a characteristic autograph, it has slight interest. Yet observe with what care the anatomy is rendered.

From this time forward Michelangelo never again had the leisure to occupy himself with only one work at a time. Orders poured in upon him, and he refused none. How could he? He had been so eager for them until now. He must lose no chance, and, as is the way of youth, he realised scarcely at all the disproportion between the moment of conception and the seemingly endless time required for the completion of any task. He was to find out soon enough. It is quite common to see on the same leaflet the sketch for one work hot upon the heel of that for another. The Twelve Apostles for S. Maria del Fiore, the Cartoon of the Bathers, the Tomb of Julius, the Sixtine Ceiling, not to speak of minor undertakings, kept up a lively enough dance in his head for the next ten years, frequently changing partners, but never permitting any one to have the lofty halls of Michelangelo's mind all to itself.

The earliest achievement of this portentous decade was probably the Bruges Madonna;\* and in one corner of a sheet in the British Museum we have a rapid sketch for this group. Done with a few pen-strokes, which yet give the full contours, it could have been the work of but an instant, and scarcely after the model. Yet the model—some burly Florentine porter—seems to make himself felt behind this inspired scrawl; for the nude apparently male figure, ultimately to serve for the Virgin, is colossal. Is it not rather Michelangelo's vision shooting far ahead of his present skill? In his mind, he was already at the Sixtine Ceiling and beyond, while his style confined him to the execution of something so dainty, so timid, so purely Quattrocento in short as is the Bruges marble.

On the other side of the same sheet we perceive two putti. I can see no necessary relation between them and the Child in the group. And still less connection if possible do I find with the infants on another sheet at the British Museum, whereon we read repeated twice in a contemporary hand *chosti di brugis*. Indeed at least two of these putti are, if I mistake not, for quite a different work. The two are those who stand in profile to right, with the arm of one under the elbow of the other, and they certainly would seem to be studies for the infant John in the Royal Academy bas-relief. But while the progress in style from the Bruges group to the London tondo is exemplary, I can descry no difference in draughtsmanship between the sketches for the two. The explanation may be offered that drawing is much more an affair of spontaneous skill, of manual gift, which, once acquired, changes, like a tenacious habit, but slowly; whereas the conception of a work of art as a whole requires, besides the flash of vision, much thought—and thought is happily more ductile and manageable than any kind of physical use-and-wont.

\* H. Wölfflin. "Die Jugendwerke des Michelangelo," 38 *et seq.*

A leaflet in the Malcolm Collection contains three sketches whose intimate association is not without significance [Plate cxxvii.]. Two of them, each of a single figure, are for the St. Matthew—the only one apparently of the Twelve Apostles, ordered in April 1503, which Michelangelo seriously worked on—the other of a skirmish, doubtless for the background of the Bathers. It is evident that the two standing figures were jotted down before the skirmish, yet it is not likely that they were done many months apart. But is it probable that the artist would at the very first have made sketches for his background? We must assume that he already had considerably elaborated his scheme. If this be true, it follows that he was pondering, if not actually working, simultaneously on the Matthew and the Cartoon. The two sketches for the Matthew moreover differ in a matter of the utmost importance from the half-finished work which happily we still possess. Professor Wölfflin has earned our liveliest gratitude for having in his penetrating, masterly way\* drawn attention to the exuberant Titanism of this work, to the colossal stride it marks in the artist's career. But of this there is no sign in the sketches before us. They represent, the one nude and the other draped, the same calmly statuesque, pensive figure, not the straining giant of the marble, whom Professor Wölfflin correctly likens to the famous Louvre Slave, struggling for freedom. In the interval, therefore, between the penning of the sketches and the attempt at carving out, Michelangelo took the ominous leap from action quasi-mediaeval to movement ultra-modern, from agreeing in the laws which every art (as indeed every other form of sane activity, and play most of all, for art is a kind of play) imposes upon itself, to violent rebellion against the limitations of form and action. But Dr. Wölfflin's hypothesis that the Matthew was left in its present condition by October 1504 does not recommend itself as probable. I cannot believe that Michelangelo traversed this gulf at a leap. As an almost universal rule, the artist finds himself slowly, step by step. And in this case, what I take to have been the steps, although long since ruined, are known to have existed, and we have a fair notion of what they were. These steps were the Cartoon for the Bathers. This was the first great task allotted to Michelangelo which, by calling forth his full command of form and movement could reveal even to himself the hidden tendencies of his temperament, and inspire him with ideas and ideals hitherto unshaped, perhaps wholly under the horizon. It is probable that an appreciable length of time intervened between the sketches for the Matthew and the execution thereof, which I would assign to one of Michelangelo's visits to Florence, at some time between the completion of the Cartoon and the beginning of the Sixtine Ceiling—and for this opinion the sketch offers confirmation. As we have seen, it has for neighbour a scrawl for the background of the Bathers. But this cavalry charge is surely reminiscent of the rival cartoon, Leonardo's Battle of the Standard, which cartoon was not finished before March 1505. The date of this sketch would thus be early in 1505, and of those for the Matthew not many months earlier, scarcely

\* "Jugendwerke Michelangelo's," 56 *et seq.*

earlier than October of the previous year, when, according to Professor Wölfflin, the marble was left unfinished. Add to this the startling transformation from the drawings to the marble, and you are surely landed beyond the completion of the Cartoon.

But if I mistake not there is another sketch by the master eager to bear witness in the case. It is a magnificent large red chalk drawing in the Uffizi [No. 620]. Like so many other of Michelangelo's red chalk drawings unequal in places, yet bold and grand. Here we have the splendid statuesque figure of a Roman general with his limbs and right shoulder bare, his head in profile to left, his right arm falling at the side, and with his right hand holding his mantle, while his extended left hand holds a baton or sword. In marble this would be a greater creation than that promised by the pen-sketches; yet if those suggested Pollajuolo and Rossellino, this suggests the mighty figures of Donatello on the Campanile. Donatello carried farther and to the utmost limits of his formula, but still Donatello's formula—nevertheless a great advance upon the intervening style of the jeweller-sculptors. So this Uffizi figure would seem to mark a halfway stage between the Matthew of the pen-sketches and the Matthew in marble. Whether the Uffizi study actually was intended for the Matthew is doubtful. If it is a sword that he holds, it almost certainly was for a Paul. But the iconographic question does not really touch the argument, for the advance in style would have taken no other course whether the ultimate object was Matthew, Paul, or, for that matter, Peter. Let me but add that this figure, marking as it does but the halfway stage to the marble Matthew, seems to me already posterior to the Cartoon. Indeed its profile has resemblances to certain sketches of profiles at Oxford which, in their turn, hover close to the Sixtine Ceiling.

Enough of this topic. Yet I must mention that another, I take it slightly earlier, stage in the shaping of the Matthew is represented perhaps by a copy in the Louvre [No. d'Ordre 322]. In this large pen-drawing the action almost entirely disappears under nonsensical draperies—nonsensical for they leave the chest and stomach bare while swaddling the arms and legs. Could such a solecism really have been committed by Michelangelo? The execution of this drawing is Bandinelli's, and I am tempted to believe that the nonsense is his also. They betray the mind of a person bent upon surpassing the achievements of his superior, and not even capable of comprehending his intentions.

#### IV

Once only, to my knowledge, has a serious attempt been made to reconstruct the Cartoon for the Bathers. It was done by the brilliant and unfortunate Moritz Thausing,\* and failed, nay worse than failed; for he based all his reasoning on a

\* "Zeitschrift für Bildende Kunst, xiii." 129 *et seq.*



sketch he had acquired for the Albertina [S. R. 156A], which sketch he believed to be Michelangelo's original. The result of Thausing's attempt would be to throw discredit on the faithfulness of the engravings after some of the figures made in 1510 by Marcantonio and in 1523 by Agostino Veneziano, and to disparage the famous Holkham *grisaille* to the extent of pronouncing it a relatively recent forgery. All this would indeed have to be granted if the Albertina sketch were the original. But far from being such, it is a note, from memory perhaps, done by some follower of Michelangelo's after, and probably long after, the Cartoon was finished. So Thausing's labour was more than useless in that it ventured to shake our confidence in our only clear record of any considerable part of the Cartoon.\* Our own examination of the few authentic drawings for the Bathers still remaining tends to the opposite conclusion, and will help to establish the substantial accuracy of the Holkham *grisaille*. Unfortunately my own acquaintance with it is limited to poor engravings after it. I cannot so much as venture an opinion of its intrinsic merits, of its authorship, or of the date of its execution. Happily these are not the most important considerations for our present purpose. The most important question with respect to it is: No matter by whom, of what date, or how distant a copy, does it or does it not give us a correct notion of the arrangement and the action of that part of the Cartoon which it copies?

The Albertina sketch would lead to a very different arrangement of the Cartoon from the one presented in the *grisaille*, and Thausing greatly prefers this new arrangement. *De gustibus, alas! non est disputandum*. I certainly do not prefer it, and what is more I do not find it Michelangesque. Michelangelo, unlike the German Raphaelist of fifty and more years ago, when he chose to present a crowd, intended to convey the impression of multitude. To this there is no exception from the Centauromachia to the Last Judgment. And I surely need not here be discursive on such a rudimentary question of composition as to how a multitude should be represented. Clearly it is not an affair of numbers, but of packing. Nearly the same number of figures appear in Thausing's reconstruction as in the Holkham sketch. But in the one, they pose for you to tell them off, in the other, it never occurs to you to ask how many they are.

The two well-known engravings by Marcantonio and Agostino Veneziano which complete one another so as to reproduce all excepting one of the front row of figures, are in perfect agreement with the Holkham *grisaille*. "That," argues Thausing, "proves nothing, for the *grisaille* may have been, nay, I believe must have been, patched together by some one acquainted with those engravings." Very well, but how account for the great divergence in arrangement between the sketch *for* the work, and the engravings *after* it? If you allow that Michelangelo made great changes, then the sketch ceases to represent the final scheme of the Cartoon.

\* Symonds in his glib way refers to Thausing's paper approvingly, but without realising in the least that the *grisaille* and the pen-drawing cannot possibly both be authentic records of the Cartoon ("Michelangelo," i. 170). Springer came independently to doubt the worth of the *grisaille* chiefly on *aesthetic grounds* ("Raffael und Michelangelo," i. p. 47).

Thausing leaves it vague how much he meant to allow for alterations, but protests that one must not take engravers too seriously, for they notoriously are given to reversing compositions; and besides, how do we know that either Marcantonio or Agostino ever saw the actual Cartoon? So be it, but reverse the engravings, and you gain little in the attempt, quite enough, however, to suggest that if any one had been reversing, it was the author of the pen-sketch—and of set purpose. True, moreover, we do not know that either of the engravers saw the actual Cartoon. But in 1510, the date of Marcantonio's engraving, it certainly was still existing, and perhaps still existed, in 1524, the date of the other. Even at the later date, the Cartoon was at any rate so fresh in memory that no discrepancies would have been tolerated.

The Uffizi treasures up as an original study for the Cartoon a black chalk scrawl [No. 613], which never could have had intrinsic merit, and now that it is half effaced has little of any other kind. Yet that little deserves more attention from us than Thausing was willing to give it. Not only is it poor—although by no means worse than many another drawing ascribed like this one to the greatest of draughtsmen—but late, its manner suggesting Alessandro Allori.\* It is nevertheless if a distant and confused yet a real echo of the Cartoon itself. It must be a hasty copy of some more faithful transcript of a part of the Cartoon, wherein were missing some of the figures in the *grisaille*, but, on the other hand, it presents certain other figures not found in the painting. These six men join on to the left, where the Holkham sketch shows a blank. It may be argued that these are but transposed from the figures which appear at the top on the right in the *grisaille*. This would seem most improbable, for there is no resemblance between any of the single figures in the two groups. The Uffizi group offers new features. Thus, there is another climber, a man standing over him, and three men running away from the river. How crudely and confusedly this represents an otherwise unknown continuation of the Cartoon we can infer from the way the known part has been treated. But that it does echo figures that actually were in the Bathers one can, I think, safely assume. I will leave all general considerations of probability and confine myself to the one bit of considerable proof that I can offer.

A pen-drawing in the Casa Buonarroti of a male nude is, in quality, in handling, in manner, even in size, so like the well-known study at the British Museum for the nude in the Bathers, whom we see sitting on the river's edge turning away from us to see what is happening, that the idea comes to one inevitably that both must have been done at the same time and for the same composition. You look for it in the Holkham sketch but in vain; nor is there any sign of it in the Albertina drawing; but we find it easily in the Uffizi scrawl. There, among the six figures which carry on the composition at the point where the Holkham sketch leaves off, you

\* Thausing expresses his belief that it was done towards 1700 by Gabbiani! A copy of this sketch by Gabbiani, does, as it happens, exist in the Uffizi and is ascribed to him.

see a nude running straight away from us with his right arm and leg in the air. The correspondence between this figure and the Buonarroti drawing is complete. The conclusion is obvious and important. Beyond reasonable doubt, the Uffizi scrawl is, so far as it goes, although dim and confused, substantially a faithful record of the Cartoon, for we possess an original study by the master for a figure that occurs in a part of the composition of which there is slight if any trace elsewhere.

If this is so, if the Uffizi scrawl is a faithful record of the Cartoon, then Marcantonio and Agostino also were faithful copyists, for the engravings are in perfect agreement with the Uffizi drawing. Happily, the British Museum figure, of which I have just spoken, clinches the argument. Compelled by the Albertina sketch, Thausing boldly does what he accuses Agostino of having done; he turns around the figure seated on the bank. But for this figure the British Museum drawing was the original study, a highly finished study moreover, needing enlargement only to go on to the Cartoon. And the figure in this authentic study from Michelangelo's own hand faces, not as Thausing would have it, but as Agostino engraved it.

The engravings being faithful, it follows that the Holkham sketch must also be faithful, at least to the extent that it bears witness. One or two more points in favour of the *grisaille* are to be derived from a further examination of Michelangelo's original sketches. In the Albertina at Vienna there is a study [S. R. 157] in pen and ink for two of the figures on the right, for the one rushing forward all in a tremble, and for him who helps his friend to buckle on his armour.\* Next to each other here, the balance of probability is that Michelangelo intended them for neighbours in the Cartoon—as, indeed, we find them in the Holkham painting. Our last witness shall be another pen-sketch [Louvre No. d'Ordre 712], as is manifest, a study from the nude model for the soldier having his armour buckled. The significant point here is the identity in action between this nude and what appears of the same figure in the cartoon. We see little of the left arm in the *grisaille*, which is as it should be, for, bent over the stomach, exactly as in the drawing, it is hidden by the nude in front. In the Albertina sketch the same left arm falls to the side.

## V

The Holkham *grisaille*, then, so far as it goes, is a substantially correct transcript of the famous Cartoon. In the Uffizi scrawl we have materials for still

\* For the torso of this figure probably there is also an excellent study in black chalk at the British Museum (1859-6-25-563). At Haarlem there is a large study in black chalk for the same figure, and a companion study for the figure in front of it, the nude lancer rushing forward to left. Considering the evidence I have brought, I need scarcely refer to the sketch in the Uffizi, probably by Daniele da Volterra, after the four or five figures corresponding to those on the extreme right in the *grisaille*, nor to a kindred sketch after the lancer and the "buttoner"—two out of the same group—in the Venice Academy. Of course their evidence is entirely for the *grisaille*.



further acquaintance with the Bathers, and by means of a number of sketches, mostly at Oxford, we can form some conception of what its background contained. Before proceeding with this, yet another word about the studies for the figures. It is possible that still other sketches of nudes, of no obvious purpose, had connection with the Cartoon. I will cite out of a number but one example. It is the pen-drawing in the Louvre [No. d'Ordre 727] for a nude seen from the back, in the attitude of pouring with his right hand into a vessel held in his left. On the same sheet we behold three helmets of fierce, fanciful shape, not unlike that on the head of one of the warriors in the *grisaille*. The singular thing about these various studies is that their draughtsmanship is so much below what we should have expected from Michelangelo at this time and for such a work. Evidently they were not spontaneous first thoughts. There are a few such among his remaining sketches, and, as we shall see, they are surpassed by no one, not even by Leonardo. But the bulk of Michelangelo's drawings now remaining are either show-pieces like many from his later years, or careful workings after the model, or after his own ideal. For, well though he knew the nude—who else so well!—it yet seemed ever to remain a problem. He never drew it by heart or by rote. It had every time to be rediscovered and once more conquered. Hence, I believe, the touch of timidity, almost of dryness in most of his studies, the deliberate elaboration of certain parts to the neglect of others, all witnessing to an eternal pre-occupation with anatomical structure.

In examining the leaflet at the British Museum containing two sketches for the St. Matthew, we find between them a rapid note for a skirmish of horse and foot. We know from Vasari that the background of the Cartoon contained skirmishes and charges of cavalry. The presence of a sketch for such a subject along with sketches for an early stage as yet of the St. Matthew gives every colour of probability to the usual assumption that this and kindred jottings were for the Bathers. Indeed, this point would not need insisting upon were it not that Dr. Frey wantonly questioned it,\* and were it not that people unable to distinguish between Dr. Frey, the able scholar, and Dr. Frey, the hasty and not always competent critic, might give weight to his declaration. In speaking of that drawing at the British Museum I have already stated my feeling or, if you will, fancy that this charge is reminiscent of Leonardo's in his famous Battle. The same feeling follows me to the Oxford sketch [No. 18] and grows upon me as I contemplate yet another sketch at Oxford [No. 16]. The latter, one of Michelangelo's most spontaneous and brilliant drawings, could certainly not have arisen without the impulse given by Leonardo. I may be in error, but I shall scarcely seem absurd. In the surmise there is nothing improbable. Michelangelo not only did not hesitate, he could not help "taking his own wherever he found it." He let Quercia and Signorelli, not to mention Donatello and Pollajuolo, inspire him. Why not Leonardo? The younger disliked the elder, and I fear in the ill-feeling there was not a little envy and jealousy.

\* "Dichtungen Michelagniolos," p. 305.

But neither dislike nor envy could have prevented his brain from catching fire on contact with the other's. Later we shall come across yet another Leonardesque motive in Michelangelo's art; so perhaps the phenomenon is not isolated.

Be it remembered, moreover, that Michelangelo's chief, nay only interest, was the human nude, and nothing but the human nude, and we shall scarcely believe that an artist so narrowly concentrated on one pursuit as was Michelangelo, would be likely of himself to have thought of introducing horses where they were not positively required. We never find them before this date. And later, only in one or two of the medallions on the Sixtine Ceiling, and much, much later in the frescoes of the Pauline Chapel. You need but glance at the last to see that he had almost forgotten what a horse looked like. Clearly the "noble quadruped" was outside the pale of his interests.

Yet behold on the same sheet at Oxford [No. 18], which contains a sketch for the skirmish, there are two or three studies of horses which are unlike any other such studies made by any other Italian of the Renaissance. It is the actual beast we have before us, of good race, well groomed, and done from the life—as free from convention as a horse by Meissonier—nay by Degas. How account for this sudden interest in the horse? In this way, I think. The horse was notoriously Leonardo's *forte*. For his painting in the Great Hall of the Palazzo Vecchio he chose a subject which would enable him to enjoy all the pleasure it gave him to depict this animal in action, and at the same time to display his skill. Michelangelo in carping, free-spoken Florence may well have heard voices, perhaps shouts: "Of course you can do the nude, but horses—leave that to Leonardo!" Nettled and stung by some such challenge, perhaps, he made this unrivalled study. And its use in the background of the Cartoon is revealed to us by a rougher black chalk sketch also at Oxford [No. 19], where we see almost the identical horse being mounted by one nude while another helps with the saddle. To assure us that this last sketch really must have served for part of the background we find on the reverse a very elaborate and admirable study for the nude last mentioned.

And now let us resume in a word the result of our inquiries into the Cartoon. The Holkham *grisaille* is substantially a correct transcript of part of it. The Uffizi drawing also is correct, although in a loose way, it is true. Wishing to form the most adequate notion of the appearance of the Cartoon that the materials will permit, we must add to the figures in the Holkham painting those which continue it in the Uffizi drawing, and place in the background the groups of skirmishers and the nude mounting the horse that we found in the Oxford drawings, besides one or two horsemen dashing off at full speed, such as we see in yet another pen-sketch at Oxford [No. 17]. To all this we should then with our mind's eye give a co-efficient of artistic value such as we find in the earlier part of the Sixtine Ceiling. Indeed I cannot help feeling that there, in the fresco of the Flood, we get an impression that cannot be greatly unlike what the Cartoon for the Bathers would have made upon us.

## VI

Called to Rome perhaps even before he had finished the Cartoon, Michelangelo immediately began to enact the Tragedy of the Sepulchre for Julius. Every tourist knows in how little this greatest of schemes ended. The loss to us of æsthetic enjoyment is immeasurable. Nor can we as much as frame an approximate notion of what its appearance when finished was to have been. Yet I question whether because of its failure we know Michelangelo much the less. Like a torrent brimmed full with the melting snows and brooking no barriers, his genius was bound to pour itself forth, if not into the Tomb of Julius, then into the Sixtine Ceiling, into the New Sacristy, on and ever on, into the Last Judgment, and at the end, spent and wearied, into the Pauline Chapel and his last attempts. For him, whose sole creative impulse is toward the nude in action, a course has been laid which has no windings. Run it he must, and, if well, a delight to himself and to us. Had we the Tomb of Julius, we should have different visual shapes, and different arrangements from those presented to us by the Sixtine Ceiling, for instance, or the Medici Marbles. It is highly probable, moreover, that, functioning to his heart's desire over a work toward which his whole soul leapt forth with joy, he would have attained to a degree of perfection that the other children of his brain, begotten on less loved mothers, do not show. But I question whether the essential revelation would seem different, whether we should have done much more than exchange the Tomb for the Ceiling. To me at least it is hardly conceivable that he could have carried both works to completion. We might have had a Michelangelo of the Tomb, but although a happier, and perhaps somewhat more enjoyable, I doubt whether he would have been a very different Michelangelo from the one we know, the Michelangelo of the Ceiling.

I shall leave it for a later occasion to speak of the few drawings which may throw light on the Idea of the Tomb and its history. Here and now, I wish to examine a few sketches which, like a star-shower between two planets, fill up the space between the Cartoon and the Ceiling.

And first, let me confess that while I appreciate the peril of differing from Professor Wölfflin on any question of Michelangelo's early chronology, I yet incline to believe that the Doni tondo (Florence, Tribuna) must have been painted after and not before the Cartoon.\* My chief reason is the one I assign for shunting the marble Matthew to the same years—that such figures, so colossally conceived in attitudes so strained, and yet so well arranged to communicate to us, as an ideated offering, so to speak, all the strength of their mighty limbs—that such figures, I say, could not have succeeded directly upon the Davids and Bruges Madonnas, but must have been prepared for by vast struggles at self-discovery and self-expression such as the Cartoon demanded. Other arguments not trivial if less

\* *Op. cit.* 52 seq.



high-sounding may be brought forward. Thus the decorative nudes in the tondo differ in growth but slightly, in actual shape scarcely at all, from the earliest in the Ceiling; those in the Flood, for instance. An Uffizi leaflet containing copies of various early sketches by Michelangelo shows us one nude who might have been a study either for the nude in the tondo leaning in profile to left against the wall on the right, or for the nude in similar attitude on the extreme right in the vast tub floating on the Flood. Then the hair, particularly the child's, is treated exactly as in the earliest Ceiling frescoes, and the forearms of the nudes are turned in a way peculiar to the period of the same great work.

For this Holy Family one drawing at least remains. It is a head in red chalk on the Casa Buonarroti, admirable as most of Michelangelo's heads in this material, done with bold parallel strokes which yet render the massive roundness of cheek and jaw in a way that would have pleased Giotto himself. It is a study from the model perhaps, and beyond a doubt for the Madonna. It is not at all so likely that the sheet of splendid pen-sketches at Berlin was drawn with this work actually in view [Plate cxxviii.]. Yet even this is not impossible, admitting it to be for a very primitive stage of the conception. At all events, this sheet belongs to the time of the tondo, certainly to no later date, perchance to one somewhat earlier. The Child here has much of the action of the Child in the tondo. The fine profile suggests at once the marble Matthew and the Creator of Adam in the Ceiling, but much more the latter.

To this same interval between the Cartoon and the Ceiling I would assign the only other painting on panel that we now possess from Michelangelo's hand—the Entombment of the National Gallery. It fills me with no little amazement that this masterpiece, this quintessence of Michelangelo's art, should encounter so little acceptance. That Symonds dismisses it as unpleasant and therefore as unauthentic, I read with no disappointment, but the objections of a critic like Professor Wölfflin may not so easily be brushed aside.\* He, I think, is misled in the first place by the tacit assumption that this unfinished panel, if genuine, should be earlier than the Cartoon, and then, and more seriously, by laying far too much stress on questions of arrangement in an artist so indifferent as Michelangelo to all but form and action. Professor Wölfflin finds in this "Pietà" more affinities than there should be with the Ceiling, and on this and other grounds concludes that it is the work of some pupil done immediately after the completion of the Sixtine frescoes.

That every bit of the surface of this picture as we now have it was seen by Michelangelo before he left it unfinished, is more than I would vouch for. It is probable that others have pottered over it. They have changed little, however, and nothing essential. The work remains, not pleasant, certainly not betwitching, but almost an unrivalled study in form and action. This unhappily is neither the season nor the place to expatiate as one should upon such a theme. I must

\* *Op. cit.* 82 sqq.

dismiss it with one or two words in answer to certain of Dr. Wölfflin's objections. To him the principal figure, the giant who stems himself with the band pulled across his thighs, is too much like a certain man upholding his wife in the fresco of the Brazen Serpent for a work like this, which, if by Michelangelo, should be so much earlier. To begin with, I see no reason whatever for placing this work earlier than a year or two before the Ceiling. My more serious division from Dr. Wölfflin is, however, on the point of likeness. I fail to see more than a superficial one, where he perceives so much more. I am struck rather by the resemblance of this giant to the Matthew. Reverse the figure, and in all essentials of movement, and even of drapery, he is the Matthew and nothing but the Matthew, with the difference, however—much in the giant's favour—that his action has a purpose. Another index of a later period our critic perceives in the band across Christ's breast. His parallel to it is the Slave of the Louvre. But I venture to suggest that this band here, as well as the one of the Slave, is essentially no different from the bandages about the heads of many of the nudes on the Ceiling. To Ruskin, I am told, these were a source of great offence, but to me of delight, for they communicate an ideated sensation of pull and resistance which vitalise the forms they enclose, and make me feel more alive. I am persuaded that it was some such feeling which impelled the artist to use these bands and bandages, and—to return to the point—I see no reason why he should not have used this motive immediately before as well as immediately after the Ceiling.\*

No, this "Pietà" is, as a composition at least, essentially Michelangelo's. No other artist was capable of putting together such a design of gigantic forms and puissant action as we have in the four principal figures of this composition. And it is the precise type of work that I expect to see him attempting after finishing the Cartoon. The fault I find is rather with the proportions, particularly of the principal female figure.

There are a number of drawings by Michelangelo for "Pietàs"—so many that presently I shall give them a section to themselves—but none of them are to be connected with any essential part of this work. But in the Casa Buonarroti there is a fine head in red chalk [Plate cxxix.], gracious and young, which, when reversed, bears so signal a likeness to the profile of the seated female in the National Gallery picture as to make it not improbable that the one was a study for the other.

Several other sketches call for mention at this point, and in the first place two splendid heads in red chalk, both done with a plasticity of effect that bronze itself could scarcely surpass, and with a control of this special material that must have inspired envy in Andrea del Sarto, its greatest master. The more powerful of these profiles, both at Oxford, is one [No. 9, Plate cxxx.] of an atrabilious,

\* No other artist varied his motives so little, once he had found one that served him. In this "Pietà" for instance, the Christ and the figure behind him foreshadow a number of later, nay, latest works, and are indeed practically identical with the late Rondanini group.

youngish man, seen in a moment of grimmest determination. His type recalls the principal female figure in the "Pietà" we have just studied, and more than one head in the Ceiling, Josiah's, for instance. Of gentler mould, no less plastic, but full of that sweetness which the greatest strength only can yield, is the other Oxford profile [No. 10, Plate cxxxi.] this time of a youngish woman, she also anticipating and suggesting more than one Sixtine head. In this connection honourable mention must be made of yet one more profile [Malcolm 58] in pen and ink, of somewhat earlier date, but with all the great qualities, although in a different material, of the last two. Finally, a word about the young Sibyl, with soul of high disdain [Plate cxxxiii.]\* We see her seated, and I make small question but that this creature, or some other, with the same pose of supreme distinction, gave the cue to the portraiture of Pontormo (his Lady at Frankfort [No. 14A], for instance), and Bronzino; so that as for every other form of later Florentine art, for good and for evil, Michelangelo may be held responsible for later Florentine portraiture as well. Then what pen-work this is, never too much to be admired!

## VII

Excepting the two lunettes which gave place to the upper part of the Last Judgment, and one or two of the medallions which have got effaced, the frescoes on the Sixtine Ceiling spread over us to-day as Michelangelo left them. Here happily we need not grope about for his ultimate purpose; and having no such object in view, we need not devote an exorbitant attention to the various sketches for this great work still existing.

But as is well known from the artist's letter to Fattucci, his first design for the Ceiling had "twelve apostles in the lunettes, the remainder being a certain space filled in with ornamental detail." A pen-drawing in the British Museum gives us, as Dr. Wölfflin was the first to descry†—(would that our studies had more Wölfflins!)—a nearly perfect idea of what the Ceiling thus planned was to have been. In the spandril—called "lunette" by Michelangelo and his contemporaries—we see an apostle seated on a massive throne which rears its baroque bulk high above him, out of the spandril into the ceiling itself. Here it is flanked with squares enframing circles, and tipped with a large diamond sticking its four points into small circles. Repeat this design twelve times, and you infallibly have the Ceiling as first planned. Dr. Wölfflin actually offers a graphic reconstruction of this scheme which I urge the student to consult. No wonder that, to continue Michelangelo's own words, "After I had begun, it seemed to me that this would turn out rather mean." It would have turned out a ceiling, somewhat grander and more powerful, but of a kind which the Quattrocento has made us well acquainted

\* British Museum.

† "Jahrb. Preuss. Kunstsamml." xiii.



with, Pintoricchio's in the choir of S. Maria del Popolo offering a good instance. Nor would it by any means have been despicable; nay, if Michelangelo had cared a fig for decoration *as* decoration, he never could have thought of such an one as he eventually left. Still less would he have departed from his primitive idea, had he been tintured with even a pinch of the fetish principle of our own times, that nostrum which prescribes strict unity of style and epoch in decoration. What that a supreme artist might conceive could well, I ask, be less in keeping with the frescoes on the walls of the Sixtine than the frescoes on its Ceiling? But Michelangelo gave no thought to this, because, except as a quarry, he cared nothing for the past, and least of all for the immediate past, not a hallowed past as yet, but merely old fashioned. He despised his primitive scheme of the Ceiling because it was old fashioned, corresponding to nothing in himself, giving no scope to him who, more than any other mortal that ever lived, was an inventor of new fashions. He hated it because it afforded no field for the birth of the "Thrones, Dominations, Princedoms, Virtues, Powers" wherewith his brain was aching, restlessly big. "And," he goes on to say, "I told the Pope that the Apostles alone would yield a poor effect in my opinion. . . . Then he gave me commission to do what I liked best . . . and told me to paint down to the pictured histories upon the lower row."\*

The other sketches for the Ceiling—they are, alas! too few—have, beside their intrinsic merit, the great value of giving us glimpses into the genesis of the various compositions or single figures. Several nudes on a sheet at the British Museum, rapidly penned, yet of most exquisite contour, are fore-studies for the sweet youths which enframe the earlier compositions, those farthest away from the Last Judgment.<sup>†</sup> Not one of them is to be identified precisely; for they were a theme on which Michelangelo could play numberless variations.<sup>‡</sup> Another sketch at the British Museum, finely hatched for the full effects of modelling, is almost undoubtedly for the Isaiah. It must, however, have undergone great changes. Not only was it reversed, not only has the prophet been given more years, not only has he been made more calmly contemplative, but he has been draped in a way which speaks for a radical change in the conception of the figure as composition. Doubtless the fresco has gained thereby in eloquence, and obvious majesty, but the sketch promised something more youthful, more full of deep, unuttered wonder, more nobly Greek. A red chalk drawing at Oxford [No. 23, Plate cxxxiv.] is for one of those most personal of Michelangelo's creations, the infant genii who act out and thus convey to us the emotions which possess the breasts of the prophets and sibyls they accompany—and in this particular instance

\* "Symonds," i. p. 199.

† In the chronology of the Ceiling I follow with rejoicing Dr. Wölfflin's conclusions. "Repertorium," xiii. p. 264 *seq.*

‡ It is different with a much larger, and more elaborated—perhaps anatomically over-elaborated—study at Haarlem for one of these youths. He is easily to be identified, for in no detail of action does he depart from the executed figure, the one with open mouth and wild hair seen over the Persica. A companion leaflet at Haarlem contains a drawing, probably from the model for the head of the same figure—a witness to the minute care bestowed upon every item.

for the boy beside the Libica. Here it is of interest to note that a sketch for the entire composition must already have existed, for the drawing is a study probably from the model for that part of the figure which we see in the fresco. On the same sheet is a study for the Sibyl's right hand, from which it would appear that at this stage the artist meant her to be less in profile than the one he painted eventually. Two other studies of single figures are for the fag-end of the work, where Michelangelo himself painted, I believe, only when it pleased him, although, as these two sketches indicate, he made the necessary preparations carefully enough. One in the Louvre [No. d'Ordre 722] is a pen-study from the nude model for the figure, perhaps, of Josiah over Pope Voius. Even here Michelangelo has made changes in the position of the legs. He made more radical ones when he decided to let a sprawling infant climb up the patriarch's lap. The other is a red chalk sketch at Oxford—almost an Andrea del Sarto in quality and handling—for the figure supposed to represent Jehoram. The fresco differs in nothing but quality from this promising study.

I am not acquainted with original designs for any one of the central compositions as a whole, and indeed with very few of unquestionable certainty for any single part of them. But I scarcely can doubt that Mr. Sidney Colvin is right in his interpretation that a certain noble head in the Malcolm Collection [No. 61] is a study for the Adam in the Creation of Man. It is puzzling, however. More poetical by far than in the fresco, it yet is not quite so characteristic of Michelangelo, and the reversal of the position is strange, for it implies a reversal of the entire composition. It is, by the way, for this Creation of Adam that we find the most unquestioned sketches of those remaining for the central composition. They are at Haarlem, and are studies from the model, done with almost the intimacy of detail of Andrea del Sarto, for limbs, torso, and parts of figures in the group of the Creator with the attendant spirits. Studies such as these imply that the present design, in its main lines at least, was already fixed. It is possible also that two sketches on a leaflet at Oxford [No. 8], one of a right leg and the other of a torso with the right arm held out, are for figures in the Deluge. It is also possible that the splendidly handled, grand pen-drawing at Oxford again [No. 1] of three soldiers conversing was a first thought for one of the Medallions which the nudes who frame in the central compositions hold suspended between them.

Happily we have sketches for two, and perhaps for all four of the corner spandrels. The most elaborate indeed of all the remaining preparatory studies for the Ceiling is the large sheet in red chalk at Oxford [No. 29, Plate cxxxv.], consisting of numerous small figures for the Plague of Fiery Serpents. This drawing, however, has except in subject nothing in common with the fresco, and as I have spoken of it elsewhere at sufficient length (see catalogue under Michelangelo, Oxford 29), I will here confine myself to noting the extraordinary—almost I had said the extravagant—fertility of Michelangelo's mind. Feeling doubtless that a composition which already anticipates the action and grouping of certain

parts of the Last Judgment could not find room in the given space, and would at all events look confused from below, he changes over to something entirely different, and, it should be added, as an illustration altogether better.

For the crucified Haman we have two sketches. By far the more interesting, Michelangelo's most lightning-like pen-drawing, and altogether one of the greatest specimens of draughtsmanship, is the one in the British Museum [Plate cxxxvi.], where we see Haman twice, once still in agony, and again with the head drooping in death. But neither of these quite suited the requirements of a composition which demanded that the figure should be seen more full face, thus serving better as a division between the two distinct scenes, namely the sleepless night of Ahasuerus and the feast of Esther. So another pen-sketch in the Louvre [No. 1974 verso] shows us Haman in almost the attitude, although reversed, that he has in the fresco.

A sheet in the Louvre is covered, front and back, with pen-sketches that I suspect of having had much purpose. On the one side is a kneeling female looking away in profile to left while she holds a head on a charger. To me, at least, it seems not impossible that this may have served as a first idea for the servant who accompanies Judith. If so, the composition must have changed radically before it was painted. On the other side of the sheet is a nude in the attitude of a David, not as in the fresco, decapitating Goliath, but looking down with a smile of triumph. I will not insist upon these drawings, for their relation to the frescoes while not remoter from the painting than, for instance, the sketch of the Fiery Serpents, is too problematical to inspire me with confidence.

On the same side with the nude for the David there is yet another sketch, wherewith we enter a debatable territory which may have belonged to the Ceiling or as well to some neighbouring domain. The sketch in question represents two women seated alongside one another, the younger giving suck to a child, while she turns to look at the older. This may have been drawn with a view to one of the groups representing the Ancestry of Christ, which fill the spandrels and lunettes. It certainly is in the spirit of these figures, and contemporary with them, but may, notwithstanding, have been intended for a Madonna with St. Anne—and drawn perhaps for a dependent to paint a picture from.

Almost equally debatable as to intention, but of greater interest because the conception is so great, is the red chalk study in the Louvre of a majestic youthful woman turning away from a book which she holds on a stand, while one child nestles by her side, and another tries to look over her shoulder. In pose and proportions, in drapery and in action, in spirit and expression, she reminds us of the Isaiah, him of the sketch rather than of the fresco. But how shall we interpret this noble figure? I can come to no conclusion, for she well may have been created for a Sibyl—but then why discarded? on the Ceiling there is none more sublime—or while pondering over this great task Michelangelo may have sketched her for some friend as a design for a Madonna with the holy Child and the



infant John. Yet another noteworthy drawing of this debatable borderland is the proudly reared head of indeterminate sex in red chalk at Windsor [Braun 113], which may have served for Joseph in the lunette over Pope Eutichianus.

But we feel the Ceiling clearly behind us when we look at the sheet of pen-studies belonging to M. Bonnat. On the one side we behold a draped female figure standing over a sitting child, a sketch I take it for a marble group. On the other side are two designs for Holy Families, the one sturdy and plainly robust, the other of high elegance such as gave the tone to Sebastiano del Piombo.

### VIII

On a sheet at the British Museum containing three studies of the lovely youths for the earlier part of the Ceiling, there is yet another study in almost the exact attitude of the famous marble Cupid at South Kensington. I have but little doubt that if this sketch be not the actual design for the marble, it at least gives us the approximate date of that work, and we thus may infer that even while engaged upon the Sixtine frescoes, Michelangelo undertook, and perhaps even carried out, other works as well. Indeed, like most of us, he seems to have found in one task relief from another, so that he never could devote all, absolutely all, his available energy to one, and one only, task. The Ceiling certainly was not finished when he made the studies for the hand of the Libica and of the boy beside her, that we found at Oxford. Yet the remainder of the same sheet is taken up with six studies, doubtlessly done at nearly the same time, if not at the same sitting, for the Slaves that were to adorn the Tomb of Julius. Three of them are tied to columns, and conspicuous among them is a study for the one struggling to get free (now in the Louvre), on which, as we know, Michelangelo was working in 1513. But these studies,\* I take it, were made two or three years earlier during those months between the autumn of 1510 and the spring of the subsequent year when work on the Ceiling was suspended. And if this be so, then they were to be incorporated in the first design for the Tomb of Julius, contracted for some time in 1505, and not in the second one, dated May 1513.

The point is of some slight importance. Professor Springer in his always suggestive if seldom conclusive studies on Michelangelo,† argues that none of the descriptions we have of the Tomb, and none of the drawings for it or after it appertain to the first design. The sculptor, says Professor Springer, must have been guilty of a degree of sycophancy, little in keeping with what we know of the rest of his career, to plan to perpetuate Julius in 1505 as the greatest of art patrons and as another Alexander, while as yet this warrior-pope had done so

\* See Catalogue.

† "Raffael und Michelangelo," 3d. ed. p. 15 *et seq.*

little for art, and made no conquests at all. But the fact remains, witnessed by the Oxford sketch, that the design of 1505 must have included these various struggling nudes who, from Vasari's and Condivi's time onwards, have always been designated "Prigioni," Prisoners or Slaves. But who first named them thus? Not necessarily Michelangelo. Originally they perhaps had no allegorical meaning, or any meaning except as pure decoration. The allegory, as frequently happens with an artist's creation capable of such interpretation, may subsequently have been read into these figures, and then accepted even by Michelangelo himself. But it is not at all impossible that it was simply dictated to him by Julius, in which case he certainly would have bothered little. To me, however, it would seem that the poet-sculptor who, in his prime, for the Tombs at S. Lorenzo thought of alluring Heaven and Earth to mourn a couple of insignificant Medici princelings, might easily in his youth have been enough of a rhetorician to plan this panegyric in marble, or, indeed, poet and artist enough to treat a high theme with no regard for persons, but—abstracting all reference to the individual to be celebrated—giving his whole-souled energies to the purely artistic chances offered by the idea.

Must we assume that the Slaves with the precise action of those on the Oxford sheet were already in the design of 1505? That design I take to have been made to show the general arrangement and grouping rather than every detail in great elaboration. It doubtless left Michelangelo free to change this and that, as his style and taste developed. I incline to believe, therefore, that in 1505 his Slaves would have been less restless perhaps, less charged with the impulse to apparently objectless action. And yet the St. Matthew was surely chiselled into its present shape soon after this date, and certainly before the Ceiling was begun. At all events, a number of drawings point to somewhat quieter, more simply statuesque Slaves. Unhappily these drawings are not all originals.

The first three, all copies by Bandinelli, are in the Louvre, very closely, even tightly hatched in pen and ink. One [No. 114] is a graceful slender youth standing in profile to left but showing most of the back, with his right leg lifted and resting on a pedestal. On the verso of the same leaf appears a similar figure and in similar attitude but, while showing a full chest, turning away more than in profile to right. If these two figures which, by the way, have all the statuesque qualities of the Malcolm sketch for the Matthew, to which they thus must approximate in date—if these two figures are, as I believe, copies of the earliest sketches for statues in the Tomb, then it would seem that at first these statues were to be abstractly decorative, for neither in their action nor in their attitude is there aught to indicate their slavery. It is easier to read servitude into the third nude [No. 119], who stands with his legs crossed and his arms lifted and bent in a way that might be expressive of suffering and straining. Decidedly a slave this time, with his arms tied behind him, but yet of calmer pose than any jotted down in the Oxford drawing, and, therefore, as I would assume earlier than these, is the large figure

in red chalk belonging to M. Valton of Paris. But this is also a mere copy, although a faithful, after some lost original. It is with not quite equal assurance that I would assign to this category the two nudes in red chalk, indisputable originals this time, which we find on both sides of the same sheet at Windsor. Yet that my conjecture is more than probable will be granted by any candid student who will compare the one here who folds his arms over his chest, with the uppermost one in the Oxford sheet. The pose and action are to all purposes identical. Both these larger figures are quieter however, and I believe of somewhat earlier date.

What connection, if any, with the Tomb there may have been between such splendid nudes as the one facing front [Louvre, No. 1974], or the Signorellesque one seen from the back [Vienna, S.R. 152] must remain problematical. But no doubt can exist regarding the destination of the slight pen-sketch on yet another Louvre sheet [No. 1972 verso]. This is of a nude with his right hand touching the back of his head—the motive clearly of one of the two Slaves now in the Louvre on which Michelangelo was working in 1513. But here the attitude is altogether calmer, with none of that nightmare struggle for release which we find in the marble. The quiet pose, and the other sketches on the same sheet lead me to infer that this slave was drawn before Michelangelo had finished the Ceiling, and even before the Oxford figures.\*

We thus have conclusively, I think, established that the Slaves, although perhaps without that designation, were included in the first design for the Tomb of Julius. Whether the Victories also were in the primitive scheme I possess no means of deciding.

But be it noted that there is no reference to Victories at any date earlier than the publication in 1550 of the first edition of Vasari. All that we learn from the contract of 1513 is that the niches of the podium of the Tomb were to contain two figures each. It was these, therefore, which, nearly forty years later, Vasari designated as Victories exulting over prostrate prisoners. Precisely how these groups were to look we can but guess, for the gigantic figures now in the Bargello, of a Victor pressing down with his knee a doubled-up captive, which two figures, Vasari assures us, Michelangelo had intended for one of these Victories, is of proportions far too colossal to have entered the niches of the podium. Yet Vasari's statement may have this meaning. Michelangelo may actually have thus conceived the Victories, but finding the theme required for its full elaboration proportions much greater than those allowed by the Tomb, he gave it these larger proportions, preferring, as would have been not at all uncharacteristic of him, to perfect a motive to the utmost rather than to stunt and stultify it down to any special demand. My belief, then, is that, although worked out without further reference to the Tomb, the Bargello Victor does, notwithstanding, represent the

\* In the Trivulzio Collection, at Milan, there is a magnificent bronze of a Slave, one of Michelangelo's noblest works. It was made, no doubt, in connection with this early scheme for the Tomb of Julius.



Victories planned for that monument; and I am confirmed in my belief by the feeling that the Victor is, in conception at least, a relatively early work, not later certainly than the Medici Tombs. It may, in fact, have been conceived in 1513—the date of the only contract which speaks of figures corresponding to Vasari's Victories—and have been blocked out not many years later in Florence.

Two drawings would tend to confirm the hypothesis I have just made. One in pen and ink [Louvre, No. 1973] of a technique compelling us to date it soon after the completion of the Ceiling, represents a nude in a constrained attitude vividly suggesting the Bargello Victor, although more probably sketched for a companion group rather than for this particular figure. The other [British Museum 1854-5-13-1] is a bold masterly sketch in red chalk of a half-kneeling nude, crushed down, with his arms tied behind him, seen in profile to right. I can scarcely doubt but that this was the study for the captive in the Bargello group, or, to say the least, for a similar companion figure. But the action of this prisoner recalls some of the decorative nudes in the Sixtine Ceiling, while the way the head is sketched in, and the prevalent style of the drawing force us to date it directly after the frescoes were finished. Thus we have two studies, closely related to the Victor if not actually for him, which can scarcely be of any other date than that of the contract of 1513, and therefore tend to prove that the Bargello group does represent the Victories for the Tomb of Julius. Is it possible that two figures in rapid outline with their arms held up, one reclining, and the other kneeling (British Museum), on a sketch sent doubtless to the stone-cutters at Carrara to guide them in blocking out marbles, also represent Captives for the same design of the Tomb? The measurements given in Michelangelo's own hand, while just barely permitting of a positive, yet incline one to a negative answer.

I have looked far and wide, but only two other authentic drawings have I been able to discover which may—nay, which must—have been made for the Tomb. I shall leave the one for the moment. The other is a pen-sketch in the British Museum [1859-5-14-824] which apparently has hitherto attracted no notice although it is nothing less than a design for the architecture of the podium of the monument. As it is the only waif in existence, so far as I know, wherein is contained in Michelangelo's own hand a scrawl of some sort for the architecture of this great undertaking, how precious would it be if it threw a light however dim on any interesting phase of the changed and diminished plans for the Tomb! Unfortunately it is a disappointment.

The sketch is of a structure consisting of four terminal figures supporting a cornice, resting, in their turn, on bases which reach up from the ground to nearly a third of the whole height of the podium. These stand out in bold relief from the background, which they divide off into three spaces. The middle of these is left a rectangle, while those to the sides have each a niche reaching up from a level with the tops of the bases to within some distance of the cornice. Obviously this, destined to but slight further change, is already the rough plan for the podium

as it was finally set up at S. Pietro in Vincoli. Indeed, the only difference made at all was in the change of the simple terminals on which the hermæ rest into the inverted baroque volutes which, given the Tomb as at present arranged with the colossal Moses in the middle, suit so much better.

Under the design are written in Michelangelo's own hand words to this effect : " This is a sketch of a part of the front view of the Sepulchre, all done in marble and carving, which part is six *braccia* high from the ground to the first cornice, and eleven *braccia* wide from one corner to the other. It is made up of seventy-seven pieces, some of which pieces [*chon que pezzi*] marked with a number are put away together in a room looking out on the court of my house along with two carriage wheels which I had made and left there, while the rest are in another room on the ground floor of my house in Rome."

Evidently this leaf was sent to some one in Rome while Michelangelo was elsewhere, probably in Florence. Now it is known that the heirs of Julius seldom gave him any peace, demanding at least to know his exact intentions. The greatly diminished tomb contracted for in 1516 seems to have given way to something more stunted still, which, according to a lost contract referred to by the artist in a letter written probably in 1525,\* was to contain six statues only—six from his own hand I take it. But his other occupations did not afford him time to execute even this simpler scheme. In September of the same year he accepts eagerly a suggestion of his friends to finish up the Tomb as a façade with no sides, like the Monuments to Pius II. and III. now in S. Andrea della Valle. These friends were doing the utmost to come to an arrangement with the Duke of Urbino as the chief heir of Julius, whereby Michelangelo would be exempted from paying out any money and from doing any further work on the Tomb with his own hands. His confidential agent, Fattucci, asks October 25, 1525, for a drawing to facilitate discussion. With a dilatoriness characteristic of this great genius but not altogether gracious personality, Michelangelo did not send the design, despite repeated requests, until nearly a year later, September 12, 1526.†

I will not be positive that the design before us is the one then sent. As Pope Clement on October 15 asked to see it, one would expect more of a show drawing. Yet it is not improbable that this is the very one. At all events I should be at a loss to assign it to another date ; for earlier than that it cannot be, and I know of no later occasion when, being absent from Rome, he would have needed or been called upon to send thither a drawing of the Tomb.

We have observed already that this design differs but slightly from the architectural arrangement of the podium as executed after 1542. But it leaves certain important questions unanswered. Were the Slaves still to be used and how—really to be strapped on as it were under the chins of the hermæ?

\* Milanesi. "Lettere di Michelangelo," p. 444 : "I wish to have Ser Niccolò understand that the sepulchre is more than half done, including four of the six figures mentioned in the contract."

† See under these various dates Frey's "Briefe an Michelagnolo."

Almost certainly not, for, between the bases upon which the terminal figures rest, and their chins, there is no place for statues each three and a half *braccia* high. Then, was the Moses already destined to occupy the middle space? I scarcely think so. Michelangelo, at the very thought of putting that statue there would have felt the need of framing it in more massively, and have indicated his new intention by changing the tapering terminals, as eventually he did, into heavy inverted volutes. Besides, in the design, the middle space is divided off in a way to suggest that the idea of a bas-relief in bronze or marble for that place was not yet abandoned.

It is now the turn of the only other sketch from the master's own hand for this Tomb. It is a mere scrawl, done with the fewest strokes of the pen, almost as Hokusai or his fellow Japanese might have thrown it off; yet, although it has remained unnoticed, it is not without considerable importance. Unnoticed—I question whether it has in recent years been as much as seen; for it is on the back of a sheet in the Casa Buonarroti [Cornice 56, No. 43], framed and screwed down, where, in short, you would least expect to find anything of interest. This scrawl displays the rounded end of a sarcophagus upon which stands a nude supporting upon it another larger nude figure that droops forward with his mitred head, almost as if slipping out of his upholder's hands—both the figures in profile to left. Would we could rede every other riddle propounded by Michelangelo's drawings as readily as this! Here we have beyond question a sketch for the group specified in the contract of 1516—"Pope Julius and two other figures to support him." True, there is here no sign of the third figure, but we expect no completeness in such a scrawl as this, and if a doubt is raised, it can quickly be put to rest. The front of the same sheet has a slight sketch for the façade of S. Lorenzo. There is every probability that both sides of the sheet were drawn at nearly the same time. Now it was only in the autumn of 1516, while Michelangelo was at Carrara, that Cardinal Giulio de' Medici made him the proposal to build the façade of S. Lorenzo. Early in December the artist was in Rome for a few days to show Pope Leo a sketch for it. What more probable than that the scrawl for the Tomb was jotted down at some moment between late in July 1516 when, after signing the third contract, he went to Carrara, and early in the following December? All the more, as we know that during these months and indeed during most of the next year he really was hard at work upon the Tomb.

Two questions suggested by the sketch demand answers. Is it not possible that, soon though it was after signing the contract, Michelangelo had already dropped the idea of two figures to support the Pope, finding one sufficient? The technique of the sketch is exactly like that of two figures in the British Museum with which we already are acquainted, obviously made to guide the stone-cutters in blocking out the marbles. In the drawing before us, the measurements are wanting, so that it was not used for the same purpose. But is it not possible, nevertheless, that that was its intention, and that it was not used for the simple



reason that before he had as much as jotted down the necessary measurements, he used the other side for a study for the façade of S. Lorenzo? Could we answer in the affirmative, the conclusion would be that he had decided to have but one figure to support the dead Julius. In my own mind there is little doubt but that Michelangelo despite contracts, existing models, drawings, and so forth, was constantly changing his mind—no small part of the reason why the Tomb never got finished.

The other question is, how was this group of the dead Pope supported upon the sarcophagus to be seen? Was it all to appear in profile to right as in this sketch? Michelangelo was apparently capable of much that shocks our taste and sense of fitness. Unfortunately we have no means of deciding, seeing that the sketch is without measurements, to help us out, and that the contract is vague respecting the entire middle space of the upper storey of the Tomb. My own feeling is that the group must have been intended to face the spectator.

Here it would be meet and fit to go on to another part of our subject, having got out of authentic drawings for the Tomb nearly all that I could extract from them. But it cannot be, for two or three spurious sketches block the way, clamouring for a hearing. As they are backed by the nearly universal voice of criticism, a hearing they shall have.

In the collection of Herr von Beckerath at Berlin there exists a tattered and forlorn sheet which Professor Schmarsow published in 1884\* as the original design by Michelangelo for the Tomb of Julius according to the contract of 1516. With praiseworthy logic, the learned professor accepts another sketch [Uffizi, No. 608], which the no less learned Springer had so thoroughly discredited that now even the custodian who paces up and down the room where it is exhibited points at it with scorn. Springer objected to the quality of the Uffizi sketch which he found to be—and therein I agree with him—beneath contempt. Professor Schmarsow retorts that the quality is not at all so bad, and quite good enough for even the greatest artist in an off moment. What a singular psychology of the artist this reveals, and fraught with consequences how far-reaching in its anarchy! But the professor is right in putting this sketch alongside of Herr von Beckerath's. They are too like one another in design and too equal in merit to have had independent origin. According to what one expects of a supreme draughtsman, and according to how well one has studied the whole body of the master's drawings, will one accept both or reject both as Michelangelo's autograph.

I have passed some twelve years in the course of which few days have gone by without my looking at this or that sketch by Michelangelo. Latterly I have spent two years doing little else than studying, in so far as it has been accessible to me, the whole mass of drawings ascribed to this Florentine genius. I have

\* "Jahrbuch Preuss. Kunstsammlungen." That Dr. Bode, not to speak of Symonds and Middleton, should accept this sheet as authentic does not surprise me, but I cannot understand how Dr. Wölfflin can follow the same course. "Klassische Kunst," p. 71.

made this autobiographic statement to justify a declaration which I have no space here to prove in full, which indeed is, like all questions of authenticity, incapable of demonstration by mere argument. My declaration is that at no moment of his career, drunk or sober, was Michelangelo capable of spawning two such abortions of draughtsmanship as these two designs. What he did when in haste we can see in such sketches as the one for the Haman (British Museum) or the even more hasty one, done certainly without the least thought of æsthetic effect, intended for the Carrara stone-cutters (also British Museum).<sup>\*</sup> Nor can haste be alleged, for both these designs are painstakingly drawn with a ruler and finished with as much care as the poor creature who did them knew how to give. Who he was I know not, nor would I assert that one scribbler perpetrated both, although contemplated from the height on which Michelangelo stands, it is painful to have to distinguish whether in the dim abyss where its author or authors lie this fumbler is solitary or has an accomplice. I judge that he was neither painter nor sculptor—he would have disgraced either craft—but probably a feeble architect, and from his manner I should place him late in the century, after Michelangelo's death perhaps.

"But," it may be objected, "have you looked to see what there is on the back of these two designs?" Yes, on the back of the Uffizi one there are, among other things, sketches in red chalk after the hands of the Dying Slave now in the Louvre, on the back of the Berlin one are various studies of legs. Now one side of a sheet is no adequate guarantee for the authenticity of the other. Here, however, the red chalk of the one is used as it was only used by Andrea del Sarto's grandchildren in art, so to speak; and as for the studies of legs they are too wiry, scratchy, and feeble to be more than copies after Michelangelo.<sup>†</sup>

Let us for a moment shut our eyes and admit that Michelangelo really did make these two designs; did draw the figures on the platform with their languishing religiosity so charged with Counter-Reformation sentiment; did draw these spectral and improperly clad winged Victories—let us admit all this, but how does it tally with the contracts, how again with all else known about the Sepulchre?

The contract of 1513 is the only one which can be brought into question here, those of 1516 and later referring to altogether different schemes, and the one of 1505 although unknown in detail, having also had another plan. But this contract of 1513 (which is nothing by the way but a description of the small model presented by the sculptor to his employers) speaks in no unmistakable terms of six figures twice the size of life, which sit around the sarcophagus. In neither the Uffizi nor Herr von Beckerath's designs is there room for more than four, which four indeed are given. Five figures of the same size are to be on the

<sup>\*</sup> Better still, perhaps, another sketch in the British Museum made for one of the façades of the Medici Tomb, at a time when surely Michelangelo was not drawing more carefully. Reproduced in Symonds, *Architectural Drawings*, No. 1.

<sup>†</sup> I will not insist upon the singular fact that before these legs were drawn the paper was twice folded. Let me add that Herr von Beckerath has more recently acquired an exact and better preserved replica of his former design, which introduces, however, no new element into the discussion.

sarcophagus, and they are to be Pope Julius with two figures at his head to hold him between them and two at his feet. There seems to me little doubt that Michelangelo would have contented himself with no symbolical *holding*, that he would have made out of these five figures a group magnificent in action, wherein four bearers really *held* and *felt* the weight of the dead Pope. The realisation of weight and support is sure to have interested the artist far more than any other consideration, and I doubt whether he would have sacrificed this matter, so essential to him, to the need of showing in full the figure or even the face of the pontiff. My own feeling is that the four figures, probably in kneeling posture, really held him up between them, or at the very least attended to him, two struggling with his weight at his head and the two others kneeling by his feet—an arrangement this which would have left him fully visible from below. What have we in Herr von Beckerath's designs? Two slim angels, as do-nothing and un-Michelangelesque as the Berlin S. Giovannino himself, taking ballet steps behind the poor old pope whom they scarcely attempt to support; at his feet nothing at all, but on the corners of the sarcophagus as torch-bearers two monstrous putti of the breed that defile the pillars of St. Peter's. Surely Michelangelo never beheld the like either as his own handiwork or as that of any immediate follower of his! Then the contract goes on to speak of a chapel attached to the wall of the building where the Tomb is to be placed, which, beginning on a level with the figures seated around the sarcophagus, climbs up to a height of thirty-five palms; in which chapel are to come five more figures—we are not told what or how—larger than any of the others. Now we must bear in mind that according to the same contract the front was to be about fifteen feet wide, and the sides nearly double that, twenty-six feet three inches, so that there was ample room on the platform, not only for the sarcophagus and for the six figures seated around it, but for the chapel, which, as it rises from the same platform, must have been well behind the sarcophagus. In the designs, however, this chapel is pushed forward so much that the seated figures are almost crowded off, and nestle as best they can in the corners spared them; and it becomes difficult to explain in what relation to the sarcophagus the chapel stands. It would have to be hollow, arching over the group of the dead Pope, yet it is drawn to look flat. Obviously the poor scribbler did not take his design at all so seriously as we are taking him and it; knowing that he was fooling, he did not even think of the space relations. But were we to take this scrawl in earnest, we should have to assume that this *capelletta*—this bit of a chapel—was not only twenty-six feet high but had a depth of more than twenty feet. Allow that Michelangelo or any other Renaissance master was capable of such an Egyptian or Indo-Chinese invention, surely he who so enlivened the podium and platform with statues would not have been contented with five statues only—as per contract—no matter how colossal, for all this vast space of wall. No—a careful comparison of these designs with the only contract they might answer to, proves their total absurdity.



These designs are, in fact, nothing but fantasias composed by some not very clever person who knew the Tomb as finally erected at S. Pietro in Vincoli, and who had before him the texts of Vasari and Condivi, and certain sketches by Michelangelo himself, as, for instance, the one at Oxford [No. 23] for the Slaves. Fantasias of this nature could have been by no means uncommon. Four of them which still remain, variations, as it happens, upon the Medici Tombs, although they are of much better quality, and much closer to the master in spirit, are singularly like our designs.\* To one of these I shall return presently. Meanwhile it is my purpose to attempt to substantiate the charge I have just made, and, as it is serious, let me repeat it: The author of these designs followed nothing like a complete sketch by Michelangelo himself, or even a copy of one, but Condivi's and Vasari's accounts, which accounts he helped out with his acquaintance with the Tomb in its final shape, with drawings of certain single figures, and with vague traditions about the upper structure.

The contract, as we have seen, speaks of six statues to sit around the sarcophagus, but Condivi mentions four, and four only do we find in the designs. The contract again specifies that the Pope shall have two figures at his head and two at his feet, and does not define their nature. In the design two figures only attend to the pope, and in character and action these figures correspond exactly to Condivi's phrase as being two angels "one of whom seemed to smile as if rejoicing that the soul of the Pope had been received among the blessed spirits, and the other weeping as if grieved that the world had been deprived of such a man."

Neither the contract of 1513 nor the one of 1516 makes the slightest mention of hermæ which, as in these designs, hold the slaves strapped, as it were, to their breasts, but speaks simply of pilasters against which the slaves were to stand—nor can my own feeling, based upon an intimate acquaintance with Michelangelo and his times, permit me for an instant to admit that he could have been capable of such a Hindu contrivance. The only drawing of his for the Tomb in which hermæ appear is the one at the British Museum for the podium which we already have studied, concluding that its date must be 1526 and that the artist must already have discarded the slaves from his plan for the monument.† In the Oxford sheet—which we must not forget antedates 1513 and was drawn with reference to the very first scheme of a sepulchre with four façades—three of the six slaves are tied to columns, the tops of which are crowned with smallish heads, mere knobs in proportion. Were I quite sure that these were columns and not pilasters I should not hesitate to offer the suggestion that they were meant to stand free from the monument like a sort of balustrade going all round it. If, however, they be pilasters, my only way of accounting for them would be to

\* Louvre, Nos. 1539, 1540. Vienna S.R. 145. Uffizi, No. 607.

† Aristotile di S. Gallo's splendid study after a section of the monument [Uffizi, No. 1741 Arch.] affords no assistance, for it was obviously done when the work was in a stage corresponding to this drawing.

suppose that they rose above the cornice of the podium—odious yet conceivable, and at all events nothing like the monstrosity of the slave-hugging hermæ. These seem due to the assumption made vaguely by Condivi and very positively by Vasari (in his second edition only), that the podium of the monument had never undergone any important change of arrangement, and that, therefore, the draped hermæ which they knew on the finished work had always been there. And our designs—to which at last we can return—have attempted simply to give a visual rendering of these stupid assumptions.

Thus far the author of these sketches agrees with Condivi and Vasari, and not at all with the contract of 1513; but from this point he begins to amuse himself with letting his not very genial fancy loose upon the crumbs of information he could pick up. Thus, although we already have seen how absurd is his attempt to realise the upper structure, he somehow did get a fairly accurate notion of the height of the monument. But that is positively all. I have small doubt, for instance, that the two figures which according to contract were to fill each niche were groups in conception and action as much as possible like the famous Bargello Victor of which I already have spoken. In the designs we see slim fair ladies, singularly like certain of Poccetti's, treading down nudes copied—mark this—from such sketches as occur on a sheet at the British Museum [No. 1859-5-14-823] for figures of rivers, Arno and Tiber, intended by Michelangelo at one moment to have a place in his scheme for the Medici Tombs. Then the four figures on the platform! I will not again dwell upon their sentimentality, but confine myself to discussing the Moses. Now it cannot but be as clear to every serious student as it is to Dr. Wölfflin and myself that the Moses we now see is a figure which Michelangelo could have conceived only while he was still youngish, still fresh from his work upon the Ceiling, if not actually in the midst of it. How his "repressed movement"—to use Dr. Wölfflin's admirable phrase—connects him with such early works as the Matthew! How he reminds us of certain Sibyls and prophets in the Ceiling! Let him once arise, as his attitude ominously presages and lo! he is almost transformed from a Moses into an Ezekiel. Indeed the more I contemplate this sublime figure, the more strongly do I feel that even before the completion of the Ceiling he existed practically as we see him now at least in Michelangelo's mind, if he did not exist in a drawing or model; and that, like the Slaves, he formed part of the very first scheme for the Tomb. But, allowing that the marble Moses was conceived later, how account for it that the Moses in the Berlin design, *ex hypothesi* dated 1513, is of a style so very advanced, so mild, so good-natured? He will not get up easily, and if he does, it will not be in fury; and as for the tables of the law, he will not dash them to the ground, but leave them carefully on his seat, for he is a most proper grandfatherly old man.\*

\* A Moses holding a table of the law on either knee strikes me as odd and I fain would know whether a similar case occurs before 1525 in Italian art.

Above the sarcophagus the Berlin designs show a Madonna floating sylph-like in a mandorla, how attached, how related, who shall tell? Michelangelo and marble Madonnas in marble mandorlas—I defy any one to bring together an absurder combination of phrases! As for the two figures waving, not standing on the sides of the chapel, they are constructed on too simple a principle for Michelangelo, the principle being that somehow they must manage, at no matter what sacrifice of proportion, to reach from one given point to another.

No, these designs are not Michelangelo's. They are at best fanciful reconstructions, or variations upon Michelangelo's themes, of a kind that were not uncommon in Florence in the last half of the Cinquecento. I have already said that three or four still exist. It will repay us to give them a glance. Until the other day all of them passed as sketches by Michelangelo for the Medici Tombs, and the one at Vienna still staggers under the burden of such attribution. This last is but a repetition, perhaps only a copy of the one in the Louvre [No. 1539, photo. Giraudon 1309]. Its author must have been acquainted with certain authentic sketches by Michelangelo. Thus his general scheme bears resemblance in several points to two authentic drawings in the British Museum [Symonds, *Architectural Drawings*, 1 and 2]. All of them have two sarcophagi standing side by side, and one Vienna design, like one of those in the British Museum, has sarcophagi with concave covers into which the reclining figures sink, as well as the detail of a round window over the tall rectangular middle space. The squatting figures were suggested by the river gods in two other drawings of the British Museum, and yet another there gave the idea for the putti clinging to the round window. The Madonna in the middle space betrays acquaintance with the fine red chalk drawing in the Louvre [No. 122 verso] for a Madonna or Sibyl, while the figure in profile occupying the space on her right was copied from the large sketch for the Matthew in the Uffizi. The other statues are perhaps the author's own invention, and the crowning candelabra, the slimness of the figures, the sentimentality of their expression, and the copious use of sepia wash fully reveal the Florentine of the declining Cinquecento.

By the same hand but even more fanciful, more in the style of art that suits the grotto indispensable to the great Tuscan villa of about 1600, is the companion sketch in the Louvre [No. 1540, photo. Giraudon 1310]. The author of both these amusing productions was, if I mistake not, Andrea Boscoli. That he, however, was not the inventor of this sort of play with the lion's beard, is testified by the fourth sketch of this series of fantasies. As I have already said, it is in the Uffizi [No. 607] where once it also passed as a design for one of the Medici Tombs by Michelangelo. Indeed, in many books it still figures as such, in Springer's for instance, and theories have been based upon it—but it now goes under the name of its real author, Aristotile di S. Gallo [photo. Braun, Florence 180, reproduced in Springer]. This sketch, if by a minor master, is yet by a real artist, and has what none of these other sketches can lay claim to, intrinsic



qualities of its own; but as design it is a fanciful variation on the themes of the Medici Chapel. Two sarcophagi with hollow covers stand against a background, the middle space of which is filled with a Madonna, the side spaces with bas-reliefs, and the whole crowned with candelabra and putti, struggling as in Desiderio's Tomb of Marsupini, but with the draperies of a curtain instead of heavy garlands.\*

A prolonged study of this fantasia of Aristotile and of Herr von Beckerath's supposed design for the Tomb of Julius leads me to suspect that the latter did not arise independently of the former. Despite certain slight differences there is, for instance, a noteworthy likeness in spirit, in action, and even in technique between the Madonna in each of them, and so there is in the more summary treatment of the minor figures. Compare, for instance, the bas-reliefs in the one with the Victories and the two figures attached to the sides of the upper chapel in the other. My conclusion would be that the author of the Berlin design is to be sought for, if find him one must, among the descendants in art of Aristotile di S. Gallo.

Having sunk to the abyss where such work as these designs attracts attention, with eyes grown accustomed to the gloom we descry differences between the Berlin designs and the kindred one in the Uffizi, the former being far less bad. The Uffizi example would seem to be a copy of the others, done, to judge by the greater sentimentality and slovenliness, a good ten years later, by a person who was going to avoid one at least of the stupidities of his original; he approached the Moses more closely to the action and dignity of the marble statue. Who this copyist was, patient study or luck may reveal some day, for there is in the Uffizi another drawing by him, also in bistre wash, for the Victory on the right and for the Slave next but one on *her* right [Photo. Philpot 2593], which drawing contains three or four lines of writing by the same hand. The character is not Michelangelo's—and this fact completely quashes the indictment made against him of having perpetrated the larger design—which is, however, an early Seicento one, whose real author may some day be identified.†

My own labour, and the reader's patience, will not have been in vain if I have succeeded in clearing out of the way drawings, one of which ever since Mariette's day, for a whole century and a half, and the others for less time but even more obstinately, have stood in the way, like heavy prison walls, between ourselves and any understanding of the Tomb of Julius. Having torn down the obstacles and swept away the rubbish, let us, before going further, take a glimpse at the image

\* There is yet another design which in this connection merits attention. In the Louvre [No. 111 verso] it also passes for Michelangelo's own and as a design for the Tombs. As a matter of fact it is not by the master, but by one of his feeble followers, by Montelupo perhaps, and is also a fanciful variation upon the great master's schemes—perhaps the earliest and to be dated about 1533. Here the river-gods have been placed on the sarcophagi, the middle space is filled with a Madonna vaguely reminiscent of the fine Louvre drawing already referred to, and over this comes a round window with putti clinging to it—exactly as in Boscoli's designs which this doubtless inspired.

† Once there was in the Uffizi a companion drawing to the last, and it was photographed by Philpot before its disappearance [No. 2592]. Here we have the two slaves flanking the right niche, two of the putti from the podium, and the reclining captive. Both drawings are on a larger scale than the design for which they seem to be studies, copied doubtless from the Berlin or like designs.

of the monument which the contract of 1513 and various indications, tested and found of value, permit us to evoke. All the more as it now will take few words.

The front of the podium was to consist of two niches each flanked with two slaves standing against pilasters on projecting bases. Each niche was to contain a group of two figures of smaller proportions than the Victor of the Bargello but more or less like it. In the rectangular space left between the two niches it was intended to place a bas-relief, probably of bronze. The sides, which were to be half as long again as the front, were in other respects exactly like the front. The back was to touch the wall of the building where the podium was to stand, and this podium was to be about fifteen feet wide, twenty-six feet three inches deep and ten feet six inches high. On the podium toward the front was to stand a sarcophagus upon which four figures, in all probability nude, were to support the dead Pope, as they laid him down on his tomb. Six figures were to sit around this group, one of whom was certainly the Moses. He was to occupy the right hand corner and to be facing somewhat to left. Attached to the wall of the building and well behind the above-mentioned figures—which, by the way, were to be twice the size of life—was to rise a shallow structure, probably rectangular, measuring from the top of the podium to its own summit, twenty-six feet three inches, that is to say, it was to be twice and a half the height of the podium, so that the whole monument was thus to reach a height of about thirty-seven feet. This shallow structure was to contain, arranged in some such niches or rectangular spaces as we find in the new sacristy of S. Lorenzo, five figures larger than any of the lower ones. Of these figures, one probably was to be the Madonna, in an attitude perhaps not altogether unlike that of the Virgin placed in the final version of the Monument.

This scheme came to nothing. Who shall tell why? Michelangelo seemed to be working at it briskly, and buying vast quantities of bronze for the reliefs. All of a sudden we find that this great plan has been given up, and on July 8, 1516, a new contract is agreed upon for a much more modest structure. I have just asked Who shall tell why: one thing is fairly clear to me, and it is that the chief sinner was Michelangelo himself. To begin with, he seemed not yet to have learned that while to him, great creator as we know him to have been, conception came with a thaumaturgic swiftness and with the rapture of apotheosis, the execution of his mighty conceptions was no easier a task for him than for others. In truth, given the vastness of his undertakings, given the material difficulties of his task—the very laws of gravitation and the hard facts of time and space offering at least a passive and ever constant resistance—his schemes were hard to achieve in exact proportion as they were great. Add that he was impatient and scornful, almost as hard to get on with as our own Carlyle, and that as he must have made life a burden for his less competent assistants who, of course, were the majority, he thus got less work out of them. I suspect, too, that Michelangelo had his moments of listlessness, long months, perhaps, of pottering about, when he could

not easily concentrate his attention upon anything, so that we find, as we have already observed, alongside even of hasty drawings, aimless phrases from the Prayer Book, snatches from Petrarch, and attempts at original verse-making, which perhaps begun in this fashion out of mere listlessness, finally settled into habits of deliberate composition. On top of all these difficulties from within and from without, which should have taught him caution in undertaking fresh tasks, came a greater difficulty than any, arising perhaps from a vague dread of finding himself some day without work, perhaps also from the ambition to be in the employ of the great. I cannot get myself to believe for instance, that he undertook with anything like real reluctance either of the two tasks which were to make the proper completion of the Tomb of Julius impossible; I allude, of course, to the façade and to the New Sacristy of S. Lorenzo. He fain would have finished the Tomb, but the offer of labour obviously incompatible with it was not only irresistible but, I suspect, desired, if not solicited. "I must strain myself to the utmost this summer," he writes June 15, 1515, to his brother Buonaroto, "to finish the work I have on hand because I suspect the Pope will requisition me to work for him." I am persuaded that it was the expectation of employment by the reigning powers that led to the desertion of the great scheme for the Tomb. Reducing it considerably, he hoped to finish it more easily, and he even agreed to undertake no other work of importance until it were done. In less than six months he was already furnishing drawings and preparing models for the façade of S. Lorenzo.\*

The Tomb never came to much. The simpler scheme of 1516 was, as I conceive it, to be something like this. The front of the podium was to be almost like the one contracted for in 1513, with the difference that the niches were to contain no longer two but only one figure each. The sides were reduced to the depth of one niche with its flanking figures. The pilasters, framing in with the figures attached to them the niches of the podium, change above the cornice into half-columns, which rise from this point to a height a third as much again as the height of the podium. Three tall rectangular spaces were thus produced, and in the middle one was to stand, within a kind of tribune, the sarcophagus with two figures sustaining the dead Pope seated upon it. Directly above this, in a niche doubtless, the Madonna was to be placed. The side spaces were to be filled each with a seated figure, and above each figure, flush with the half-columns, there was to be a bronze relief. Another seated figure with another bronze relief over it was to occupy the space above each of the side tabernacles. Even this could not be executed, and not many years afterwards Michelangelo began to act upon the resolution to touch the Tomb no more. Its final shape differs from the general scheme of 1516 only in that it abandoned the sides and all the bronze reliefs.

And is our loss so very great? I have asked and answered the question once

\* I am happy to note that in his recent work on Michelangelo, published since the above was written, Professor Justi, working from the historical side, has reached conclusions similar to mine regarding Michelangelo's conduct and responsibility in his affair.



before, yet it is worth repeating. I am convinced that, given Michelangelo, it was impossible for him to finish all the work he had undertaken. Nothing that I have been able to learn of the Tomb of Julius leads me to believe that, if finished, it either would have revealed its creator as greater than we know him from his other achievements, or that it would have made us richer. Considering that arrangement was not Michelangelo's highest gift, considering, too, that we possess such sublime fragments of the Tomb, I question whether it is not on the whole a blessing, that instead of finishing it, he revealed himself so much more fully in the Ceiling, in the Sacristy of S. Lorenzo, and even in the Last Judgment.

## IX

On June 14, 1514, Michelangelo undertook for his friend Metello Vari the marble Christ which, suffering the delays and vicissitudes inevitably accompanying the fulfilment of all his tasks, was finally placed on Christmas Day, 1521, where we still see it, in the Minerva, at Rome. Even then it was not wholly the master's own work. The face and the extremities had been chilled by incompetent assistants into an icy smoothness. How, in after years, he could bear to see it, knowing that it was passing entirely for his own, is a mystery, unless indeed we offer the not improbable explanation that the head and extremities were indifferent to him, the torso all in all—and the torso here is nearly faultless. A fine, carefully hatched pen-drawing, belonging to Mr. J. P. Heseltine, is for this Christ, but has perceptibly more of a twist to the torso, more of the "restrained action" characterising the Matthew, the Moses, more than one Ceiling figure, and even the Slaves, so that I fain would follow Dr. Frey's suggestion,\* according to which this sketch was made, not for the Christ we now see, but for the first version commenced soon after the contract, which version, however, because of a flaw in the marble, Michelangelo cast away.

For the enterprise which, if completed, would have been the vastest of all, for the façade of S. Lorenzo, there exist but three or four slight sketches in the Casa Buonarroti,† made, doubtless, just before December 5, 1516, the date when Michelangelo went to Rome to discuss this affair with Leo. In the following year a model was constructed after the artist's directions. Drawings, one would therefore suppose, must have been made for the sculptures and reliefs, for he obviously was going to treat the façade as a mere frame-work for statuary and bronzes—producing an effect, if once you translated it from the childish to the sublime, as of the frontispiece to the Pavian Certosa. This plastic decoration, moreover, was going to be so copious that, although with his usual obliviousness to time, he stipulated to complete it in eight years, no one life-time, it was judged,

\* "Briefe an Michelagnolo," 187.

† Cornice 29 [Nos. 44 and 47]. Cornice 42 [No. 91]. Cornice 56 [No. 43].

could bring it all to perfection.\* Nevertheless, I have not been able to find a single sketch for the plastic work on that façade, concerning which Michelangelo felt he could—to use his own words—make it “such that it shall be a mirror of architecture and sculpture to all Italy.”

Michelangelo now had to carry over and above the burden of “*the Sepulchre*” the vaster load of the façade of S. Lorenzo; scarcely had he shouldered it, when, piled upon it, came the project of the New Sacristy with its tombs. Giulio, both as Cardinal Medici and as Pope Clement, loved art and renown too well, realised too keenly the brevity of life, the vicissitudes of fortune, and the indifference of posterity, not to urge on with every spur of friendship and authority, the great artist whom he so exquisitely appreciated, to the completion of this, an undertaking so dear to himself. Ruin and rage failed not to do their utmost, and the New Sacristy after all remained unfinished. Yet—I make the suggestion humbly—it perhaps is not altogether unlike the condition to which the artist himself meant finally to bring it. A minute study of the documents concerned, combined with my reading of Michelangelo’s character, careful consideration of the monuments in their present shape, and long musings over the original sketches for them, leave me with something like a conviction that their creator had ideas of his own which he never threw before his employer; that to all the latter’s schemes he resisted, never audibly, but with the gentle means of mute delay; that he made this and that design to amuse Clement; but that, from a relatively early moment in the enterprise, he intended that the arrangement of the principal groups should be very much what they actually came to be. How clear at the very start he must have been in his own mind regarding several of the single figures, we know from the significant fact that but four or five months after the real settlement of the agreement with Medici, Michelangelo was not only making models but ordering the marbles for them to be cut to measure. One of the figures, the Madonna, is mentioned especially.

It was certainly not the creation of the figures that offered difficulties to the artist, but the architectural setting. That required serious study on his own part, and demanded an understanding with his employers. Yet all along he must have intended that those figures, for which he ordered the marble in April 1521, should be so placed as to appear at their full value; for so surely as these came to him with the greatest ease of conception, they as surely must have been his favourites. Now, in every probability, these figures were precisely those which in various degrees of finish we see now. Apparently no other figure was really as much as seriously begun by Michelangelo. Foreseeing early that Michelangelo with his own hand never would complete all the statues planned for, Clement suggested as an assistant Andrea di Sansovino, the next greatest living Tuscan sculptor, but Michelangelo would not hear of it. He was bearish we know, could brook no

\* By contract all the statuary and bronzes were to be executed by himself. Nay, he even thought he could do the whole in six years. Milanese “Lettere,” p. 384.

approach to a division of authority, but I suspect that that was not all. I incline to believe that early in 1524 he already had made up his mind to *manage*, if he could, to have no more marbles than really would show well in the limited space of the New Sacristy. I will not say that he would not have submitted to doing more than he has done—he must, for instance, have had some definite plan in mind for figures to accompany the Madonna originally intended for the tomb of the elder Lorenzo and Giuliano—but he put off and off in the hope, I believe, that more would not need doing. And time and chance brought about an arrangement which, I cannot help thinking, he must have felt to be, on the whole, right. Hence, I take it, he again and again turned a deaf ear to all solicitations for advice how to complete and fill up what, according to others, yet needed doing. It may be mere chance, but at all events it is singular that the only two figures not done by himself which really took their place in the New Sacristy are those two which the Madonna requires at her side. The figures of Earth and Heaven which Vasari tells us were allotted to another sculptor, Tribolo, at the same time as the last two, came to naught because, says our informant, of Tribolo's illness and the death of Clement. Now it is highly probable that Tribolo was one of the artists who, in 1537, helped to bring the Sacristy into its present condition.

Go to this silent Sacristy now, and, placing yourself before the sarcophagus above which sits Giuliano over the figures of Night and Day, note the harmonious compactness of the triangular mass, and how perfect a realisation it is of Michelangelo's continuous striving for the utmost movement, compatible with the least displacement and confined to the smallest space, yet instantaneously seizable, lucid, and perspicuous. Looking at this group as a whole, you can wish no line or curve other than it is. The exact position of the reclining figures, the action of every limb, almost every ripple of the skin is determined by laws of harmonious compactness. More at ease, better supported, as I have heard so many urge they should be, and others protest that Michelangelo must have meant them to be, they would sag down and get too far away from the Duke. Give him a more spacious niche, as so many demand, protesting again that the existing one cannot be after the creator's intention, and he, in his turn, would seem to float off distant from the Night and Day. I for one find the arrangement perfect, and, for reasons I shall give later, have no doubt that we now behold these three figures, and the other three opposite, placed exactly as Michelangelo intended they should be. Note that the middle niche has been left as simple as possible, with no such lunette and consols as decorate the side niches. Why? That you may by no mischance read it off as one of three, instead of what it is, a plain niche, whose importance is accentuated by the more ornate niches that flank it. And that is the use of these side niches, and they serve their purpose perfectly, and in a way that would not have been bettered if each contained a statue. Now try with the mind's eye to see the niche on our right of the Duke filled with Tribolo's nude figure of "Earth, crowned with cypress, mournfully, with head hanging and



arms flung far, lamenting the loss of Duke Giuliano," and the other niche with a figure of "Heaven, with arms uplifted, smiling and gay, beaming with happiness over the honour and glory which the soul and spirit of this Lord had brought her."\* Imagine the statues thus contrived, and try to conceive how remote all this expressiveness is from a great artist, who always made the whole figure speak, not the face alone, and endeavour to realise how abhorrent to his sense of compactness all this gesticulation would be.

It must in candour be stated that Vasari's account of these statues should be taken with great reserve. To begin with, it offers altogether too close a parallel to his own description of the angels intended to be at the Pope's head in the Tomb of Julius. A more obvious and determining objection is that these side niches (which seem to have had their present shape as early as 1524) could have afforded but scant room for gesticulating figures. It is by no means improbable that Messer Giorgio was drawing more on his own conception of what should have been, than on what he knew actually to have been. So let us not mind his exact description, and imagine any two statues as quiet as you please in these two niches, the only requisite being, for the simple reason that they have no room to stand in, that they shall be seated. What, then, becomes of the group of three splendid figures that we have already? Stupid ruin! All the subtle harmonies are lost, no longer is there an imperative reason for every slightest curve, for every ripple of movement. Instead of a perfect group of three figures, we should have five separate statues which might almost as well be anywhere else as here. All the artist's audacious ventures, then, become impudent. There remains no reason why the heads of the reclining figures rise over the cornice, why their knees are just on a level with it. These were arrangements made to accentuate their compact unity with the Duke, and the predominance of the whole over the background; but the addition of two other statues would have turned all these subtle calculations into something so forced and wilful as really to deserve the blame which the majority of the dull-eyed, fluent-penned critics give to the existing group.

"These considerations of yours are very clever, yes, very clever," I hear some one say, "but to be serious for a moment, surely you would not deny that these figures of Heaven and Earth were in Michelangelo's own design?" No, I am well aware that in the Casa Buonarroti there is a most singular leaflet upon which we find written in the master's own hand at the top to right "Earth," and to left "Heaven." The same words are then repeated about an inch lower down, thus leaving a certain space between "Heaven," "Heaven," and "Earth," "Earth," on which space there doubtless was to be placed the statue of Giuliano, as the following lines, written just below these four words, oblige us to assume: "And Day and Night speak saying: We have in our swift course led Duke Giuliano to the grave; and it is but right that such vengeance as he taketh, he should take. And this is his vengeance: As we have slain him, so hath he slain us, taking from us our light,

\* "Vasari," vi. p. 65.

and although his eyes were closed yet could he seal ours so that they no longer shine in splendour upon the earth. What then would he have done to us were he alive!"\*

Who will not feel even through the muddy medium of the translation the sovereign grandeur of this utterance. To find its parallel we must come down the track of time to our own day, to that sublime prose-poem of Tourguenieff's which recounts what discourse passed across the æons between Jungfrau and Finsteraarhorn. But at the moment, the writer in Michelangelo was outweighing the sculptor, and I doubt whether after recovering balance he could even have meant to attempt what he, of all people, must have known to be impossible, namely the transubstantiation of poetry into sculpture. It would seem rather that this prose-poem must have been written down soon after Giuliano's death, when feeling was still of the kind to take a poetic rather than a plastic form of utterance. And this impression is deepened in me by the fact that in no authentic design for the Tombs do I find anything like a sure trace of such figures as the Heaven and Earth; I strongly suspect, therefore, that they never formed part of Michelangelo's matured scheme, and that the poem may be responsible for Vasari's story, and even, should the latter's story prove to have truth in it, for Tribolo's attempt.

And now it is high time to look at the designs themselves. Putting aside the spurious drawings still figuring unmasked in the literature of the subject, which, however, we have disposed of already while studying kindred mountebank sketches for the Tomb of Julius, I find but few which throw light, dim enough for the most part, on Michelangelo's intentions with regard to the disposition and arrangement of the Tombs. Of these, all but two in the Casa Buonarroti and one at Oxford [No. 42], are in the British Museum. That Oxford one, however, although not from Michelangelo's own hand, is yet not the least interesting for our purpose. Let us, then, begin with it. Obviously the arrangement of three niches, with a seated statue in the middle niche above a sarcophagus, is exactly the arrangement that we now see. How important, then, could we know just when this, the final arrangement, had been reached! Happily we can know, for in the upper left hand corner, probably in Michelangelo's own writing, occurs the date June 16, 1524, and there is no ground for assuming that the drawing was of much later date. We can, however, increase our certainty, for on the seventh of the same month Fattucci had written that he knew that one

\* In Dr. Frey's transcript :

El Di e la Nocte parlon e dichono :  
Noi abiano chol nostro ueloce chorso chondocto alla  
                morte el ducha Giuliano ;  
è ben gusto, che e' ne facci uendecta chome fa.  
E la uendecta e questa :  
Che auendo noi morto lui,  
lui chosi morto a tolta la luce a noi e chogli occhi  
                chiusi a serrato e nostri, che non risplendon più  
                sopra la terra.  
Che arrebbe di noi dunche facto, mentre uiuea !

of the walls intended to contain a Duke was nearly finished.\* And yet again, another letter of the same correspondent helps to explain the purpose of this slight sketch, its variations from the finished work, and why it was not made by Michelangelo himself. In this missive, dated January 30, 1524, Fattucci writes to the master to tell him that "the Pope is eager to know of every bit that you intend doing, but, anxious to save your time, will be contented with drawings made by Stefano [the first assistant] or any one you wish."†

This sketch, then, was probably one made by some follower, perhaps the Stefano named, to be sent to Clement, and the *porticuole* which he wants to know about are, no doubt, the niches in this very design. As it represents an intention, and not the finished work, we are not surprised to note interesting variations between the latter and the sketch, all to the advantage of the work as we now see it; for in the drawing the middle niche is much too important, and in other respects still far from the perfect felicity of the present arrangement, to arrive at which it must have taken further toil and trouble.

The British Museum designs, as well as those of the Casa Buonarroti, must all be of earlier date, for they witness in various degrees to a much less matured, nay, to an altogether fluctuating and perplexed state of mind on the part of the artist. As early as November 23, 1520, he sent Cardinal Medici a scheme for a structure, four-square, with a tomb on each side; and five days later the Cardinal, acknowledging receipt of the same, expresses satisfaction, not daring to do otherwise, but ventures to suggest that the mass will be over-loaded, and look, as indeed it would have, rather out of place in the limited space of the New Sacristy. This objection was doubtless the chief cause for abandoning the plan, and adopting the later one, namely, of monuments along the walls. Of the eight or nine sketches for this work by Michelangelo himself, four are for this first scheme and must antedate the 23rd of November, 1520. Perhaps as early as any is the slight pen-sketch in Casa Buonarroti [Cornice 42, No. 88]. It is a tallish, narrowish composition, consisting of a sarcophagus, standing high against a background containing three niches, and upon the sarcophagus two figures reclining in the exact attitude of the Night and Day, Dawn and Twilight as we now see them. Thus the poses of these figures—so uneasy, so sure to slip off, as we are told—certainly formed part of the original intention of the sculptor. In the middle niche above was doubtless meant to come the statue of one of the Dukes, and we must imagine a repetition in essentials of this arrangement on every other side of the four-square. Another sketch in the same collection [Cornice 18, No. 49] shows a tomb consisting of a sarcophagus covered with two volutes placed at an angle, and supporting between them a circular slab, the whole standing

\* Io per me gli [the proposed tombs of Leo and Clement]arei messi doue e duchi; ma per auerne quasi fatta di quadro una, non ci è ordine. Frey, "Briefe an Michelagnolo," p. 230.

† Arebbe caro, quando uolete fare niente di nuouo come le porticuole . . . di uedere et di sapere quello disegniate di fare; et disse, perche uoi non perdessi tempo, che uoi gli facessi fare a Stefano o a chi uoi uolete. *Ibid.* p. 210.



against a background of three divisions, the middle one projecting above the others. A slight variation of this plan appears in one of the sketches upon a sheet in the British Museum [No. 1859-6-25-545]. Here the top is flat, with figures standing upon it, and the monument itself leaves no room in the middle division above the circular slab for a statue, but for a bas-relief only. The sarcophagi in the last two schemes were also, we cannot but believe, meant to have reclining figures upon them, only as the volutes are convex, they would have taken a somewhat different and far from happier pose.

On the same sheet with the last, occurs another sketch of a very different scheme. Here the sarcophagus, basin-shaped, supports a large slab with sides curving gently inward to its top which, on a level with the second cornice of the background, is crowned with a sweeping volute. Above this the background consists of one field almost square, framed in by two half-columns at each side and a massive cornice at the top. And clinging to the slab, but seated on the base of the whole structure, we see at each side a nude in an attitude with which the Sixtine Ceiling has made us familiar. To leave no doubt that this was a sketch for the four-square monument, we not only see these clinging figures at each of the sides, but an architectural plan as well. Yet another sketch for the first scheme is, if I mistake not, the one in the British Museum [No. 1859-5-14-822] which alongside of a plan for a four-square structure, shows a flat topped sarcophagus standing against a tallish background. This consists of a large pedestal topped by a window-like niche to contain a statue, the niche being flanked with two rectangular spaces lower than itself, intended apparently to contain garlands. Against the pedestal lean two nudes.

It was perhaps directly after noting down this last sketch that the first scheme was abandoned to give place for just a moment, I take it, to an idea less objectionable in respect to the space at command, but in itself less happy. On the back of the leaf whereon we saw the last sketch we find another for the new scheme (reproduced, Symonds, *Architectural Drawings* i., facing p. 384). It betrays much indecision and perplexity, and is a most singular affair. Behold, two sarcophagi covered each with even two concave volutes within which lies, as best it can, a drooping figure. Between the two sarcophagi rises a tall pedestal whereon stands a colossal statue, in military dress and intended perhaps for one of the Dukes. How to treat the background above the two sarcophagi Michelangelo seemed here unable to decide, for he has made each part different. The one to our right almost repeats the design on the back of this same sheet, of two nudes leaning against a pedestal, and so on. On the left he contents himself with a vague indication of one opening topped by another. Even more undecided was he about the exact shape of the sarcophagi. The right one has elaborate inverted volutes at the base, whereas the other is flat-bottomed, to leave room under it for the shelved figure of a river god.

Far from happy would Michelangelo be could he know that proof of such fumbling, of such uncreativity, had survived. But all genius has its moments

of eclipse, and here we catch him in a mood dull and stupid enough to have furnished inspiration to nearly all the later people, such as Boscoli for example, who tried to improve, as we have seen, upon the Tombs as they were finally left. For us, however, it is consoling to find, alongside of these awkward attempts, a sketch for the *Twilight* in such a state as needed no further change to be completed. Thus in each order of these designs we find clear indication that these reclining figures, little varied from those we know, existed in the artist's mind from the beginning. Happily we see Michelangelo on a much better road again in two further sketches, rapidly done with the pen, at the British Museum [No. 1859-6-25-543], for the same not over fortunate scheme. In the one we see two sarcophagi standing on a platform against a background consisting of six divisions, the three upper ones greater than the lower ones. The upper middle division is topped with a volute, and contains a statue, and in the two lower side ones we find in each a seated figure, that to the left most probably Giuliano, the other Lorenzo. On the back of the same sheet appears a somewhat more elaborate design for a kindred scheme. Here, also, two sarcophagi on a platform stand against a background. Its base consists of three divisions, of which those at the sides were to contain garlands. The upper middle space is a window containing a seated statue. Each side space has a standing figure, with a square division above, containing a circle. Which of the pair of tombs Michelangelo had in mind while making this drawing I cannot decide, although I suspect that it may have been the one for the elder Lorenzo and Giuliano; the seated figure would thus be the Madonna, and those at the sides the Cosmas and Damian.

I question whether in his own mind Michelangelo ever seriously entertained the idea of having two sarcophagi alongside of one another. If he had, he must have abandoned it quickly, and arrived at the scheme eventually adopted. A stage closely preceding this last must be represented by the only remaining sketch for the groups as wholes that I know. It is a black chalk drawing in the British Museum [No. 1859-5-14-823] of the highest interest. The sarcophagus differs from the one erected only in minute details, and in the fact that between the volutes we still perceive a circular slab such as we found in two or three of the earliest designs, but here much diminished. On it recline two figures, not rising, however, quite so high as we now see them. The sarcophagus stands on a pedestal of its own, as in the finished work, and the pedestal rests in its turn on a platform. The background differs from the one we now see only in that the middle division is much broader, in that there are half-columns at its sides instead of fluted pilasters, and in that the top is far more ornate, consisting of three divisions, of which the side ones contain bas-reliefs, and the middle one a panoply piled high. At this point the reader who has not seen this design, might well ask why it could not have been for the early four-square scheme. That we know was to contain but one tomb at each side. This must have been intended for two, as we shall grant if we note that to the left of the sarcophagus, in a lower division of the back-

ground, appears the seated figure of Giuliano, which doubtless, if this particular design had been carried out, would have had Lorenzo to balance him on the other side.

I still have to speak of the feature in this design which makes it so highly interesting. On the platform we find, not stowed away as in the nightmare sketch for the double tomb, but reclining to right and to left of the pedestal which supports the sarcophagus, two river gods, each with one arm resting on an urn. Follow the mass made by these two figures and those reclining on the sarcophagus, and you get a triangle which cries to have for apex a seated statue. The want of it in this design must have furnished no less of an artistic reason for the abandonment of this plan than the social one of the insignificant places given to the two Dukes.

These varying schemes had by 1524 given place to the present one. In that year, as we know, the walls were already being prepared to receive the statues of the Dukes, and as in every probability Michelangelo actually put these in their places, there can be no serious doubt that the background we now see is exactly what he intended it should be. Several of the designs have yielded conclusive proof that the reclining figures also lie in the precise attitude that he meant to give them; and if still further proof be required, it is given us in a letter of Fattucci's, wherein we are told that as early as April 3, 1524, Michelangelo was making the sarcophagi.\* These also, then, are certainly as the master desired them, and upon their exact shape depends much in the pose of the figures upon them.

Documents, drawings, and æsthetic considerations—the last more important for me than either of the others—remove all doubt in my own mind that the groups of the reclining figures with the Dukes that we still see, are in the exact position Michelangelo meant to give them.† But what of the river gods? On October 24, 1525, he writes to Fattucci that he had not yet begun them, but drops no hint that he had abandoned the idea of them. Writing to the same correspondent in the following June‡ he says expressly that he wishes to do the four Rivers, and to do them with his own hand. After this date no further mention of them is to be found. And I ask whether even then Michelangelo seriously intended to execute them. Vaguely he may still have meant it, but it would seem, as I have already said, that while he was perfectly clear from the very start about the seven figures which are all he really did do, he never quite faced the problem of the others, certainly not seriously. His attention was given, so far as other tasks permitted, to the reclining figures, the Dukes, and their arrangement. Perhaps he never quite said even to himself that he would not do the river gods,

\* Frey, "Briefe an Michelagnolo," p. 221.

† The whole background is Michelangelo's in design, and in April 1526 was as good as finished. Milanesi, "Lettere di Michelangelo," p. 453.

‡ *Ibid.* p. 450.



still less the Heaven and Earth. I have already given such reasons as I can offer why he never, his scheme once matured, could have intended to carve the two last-named statues for the niches beside Giuliano. Similar reasons persuade me that from 1524 on he could not seriously have contemplated the Rivers.

The last design that we have examined shows us these figures in the only possible place that Michelangelo, as an artist, could have proposed to give them. There we saw them reclining on a platform against the background, and tending to form a triangular mass with the figures on the sarcophagus. With our mind's eye let us picture to ourselves the Giuliano over the Night and the Day, and below (in such wise as to continue down to the ground the triangle these form) two river gods. Leaving aside for the moment absurdities to which I shall have to return presently, the obvious criticism is that the effect would then be of a huge triangle framing in something. It would no longer seem like a group using the background yet independent of it—a group, moreover, holding together with the most exquisite compactness—but on the contrary would make almost the impression of something in mere relief, too drawn out, scattered even; all this grandeur serving the petty purpose of framing in the mere sarcophagus.

Now I cannot believe that Michelangelo, once he had found the perfect arrangement of the three figures, could have entertained in earnest the intention of ruining it by adding two such others as the Rivers would have had to be. And it is clear that once he had begun to build the background, these Rivers must have been abandoned. We may just barely suppose as a further alternative that the sarcophagus, instead of standing on a pedestal as we now see it, and as we found it in the last design, was to rest directly on a platform, on which platform were to come the Rivers also. Grant this, and we are landed in an æsthetic absurdity, with these figures projecting, as on this assumption they would have to do, by half their length to right and left of the rest of the monument, and even beyond its background—a notion absolutely inconsistent with all good feeling for sculpture.

My conclusion, then, is that in every probability the two principal groups in the New Sacristy are now seen by us exactly as Michelangelo intended we should see them, and that after his own mind was clear about each of these three figures and their background, which mental event must have occurred very early in 1524, if not even sooner, he never seriously purposed that other figures should be grouped with them.\*

Just what he meant to do with the two other walls of the New Sacristy Michel-

\* Drawings for the single figures of the two groups are rare: The following are the only ones of unquestionable authenticity that probably may be connected with them. Curiously enough they all are for the Giuliano group, the one on which the master worked first and with clearest design. They must have been made before the exact position the figures still have was decided upon, before 1524, therefore, and there is no reason why they should not have been drawn at the very beginning of the scheme, for, as we have seen, reclining figures formed part of nearly all the rival plans. The presence, however, in the Haarlem sheet of a sketch for Giuliano's two knees, alongside of two studies for the left

angelo, before abandoning this task, had never perhaps fully decided. Nearly thirty years afterwards Vasari tried in vain to get him to tell. A pen-sketch in the Casa Buonarroti [Cornice 42, No. 93], of singular identity in manner and touch with the slight drawing in the same collection of a sarcophagus with the reclining figures upon it, is in every probability of the same date, and may, it seems to me, be a design for the altar, not, of course, for the present altar, but for the one that was to face one of the sides of the first projected four-square monument. We see, over a table, a recessed arch flanked by two rectangular divisions with a standing figure on a pedestal in each. Over these are windows, between which is a panelled space, and the whole is topped with statues. This might have been very good, but it never came to anything. The altar that we now find in the sacristy is very likely Michelangelo's invention, and stands certainly where he must have meant to place it. As for the tombs of the elder Lorenzo and Giuliano, his intentions concerning them never perhaps became precise, despite the fact that the Madonna, meant to be the principal figure of that group, was probably the very first statue that he began, being, as we have seen, the only one mentioned by name in April 1521, in the first contract for marbles at Carrara, and not only mentioned, but specified as completely designed. I think there was a reason for the surprisingly early beginning of this statue for a group which otherwise does not seem to have seriously interested Michelangelo. The reason was that the artist, apparently without definite object, had for a long time past been making studies for a seated Madonna suckling the Child: so that when the order for the New Sacristy came, he either had merely to take the most satisfactory of these sketches, or at any rate found himself so well prepared that he could at the briefest notice strike off the requisite design.

There are several studies for this theme by Michelangelo himself, all earlier, however, than the first planning of the Sacristy, and made therefore without reference to it. Yet, as they inevitably lead up to the Madonna there, we shall scarcely find a fitter moment to examine them.

Not yet the motive itself, but an adumbration to it, occurs in a sketch which, for reasons given elsewhere (see catalogue under Oxford 22), I am disposed to assign to a date as early as 1501. Here we have the Leonardesque theme of the Virgin

leg of the Night makes a date closer to 1524 more probable. All these sketches are in black chalk, and are of the same tentative searching quality, so characteristic of Michelangelo when seeking for the exact accent of the nude:—

Oxford 6. Study for the torso, right arm and two legs of the Day, but in more erect position than the figure finally took.

Oxford 7. Study for the torso and right thigh of the same, with faint indication of the beginning of the arms. Although done at the same time as the last, this sketch shows us the figure in practically the exact attitude that the marble now has.

Haarlem 11. In the last drawing, the right leg is missing. On a leaf at Haarlem there is a large study for this leg, with the foot, however, not quite in its present position, and singularly over elaborated. Pasted together with this leaf is another on which are a study for the knees of Giuliano, one for the left thigh and knee and another for the knee and leg of the Night, none quite in the position that the corresponding parts now have. And in the British Museum [No. 1859-6-25-569 verso] there is a study of the exact quality of the Oxford drawings for the torso and left thigh of the same figure of Night, in almost the exact position that the finished marble has. Both this and the other sketch for this figure have no female characteristics, and this is interesting, showing as it does that instinctively Michelangelo thought of the human form as something abstract and sexless, giving the distinction of sex to his figures only in a later stage of their growth in his mind.

seated on the lap of St. Anne, but we can easily see that this Virgin is so constructed and so articulated that it will cost the artist no great pains to transform her into the S. Lorenzo marble. Some ten or eleven years later, while planning the family groups in the lunettes of the Sixtine Ceiling, Michelangelo designed one such group of two women sitting together [Louvre, No. 110], the younger turning sweetly to the elder, while the child in her lap searches for her breast. The treatment of this idea has all the high refinement of the suavest Tanagra groups, but with a depth perhaps more than Greek. Then, a year or two later, comes another study of the theme, but here for the first time the child is actually sucking. This drawing [Louvre, No. 1973 verso] shows us two nudes seated almost parallel to one another, both looking to left, and the one to right, she who has the child on her knees, with her hand on the other's shoulder. A woman suckling, in a drawing in Vienna [S. R. 34] which can, with something like certainty, be dated 1514, differs from the one in the last only in that she is draped, and that instead of looking away she looks attentively down at the child. Some weeks, or at the utmost months, afterwards, Michelangelo must have drawn the splendid study in black chalk at the British Museum—all the others, by the way, are in ink. Here the woman is nude again, and again looks away, but this time to the right, and the child sits firmly astride her right knee instead of resting, as in the last two, upon her left. By these changes the design advances toward the Madonna at S. Lorenzo. But the attitude is too simple to have long satisfied Michelangelo at this time. The legs apart, the look directed afar off, the too easy pose of the child could not content his dominant purpose, in sculpture at least, from now onwards. I have already attempted to characterise it as being a striving to pack into the least possible space the utmost possible action with the least possible change of place, and the repetition of this statement here will help us perhaps to understand why the sculptor abandoned all these designs and finally evolved the one we now see in the marble. In the marble the Madonna's legs are crossed, her head droops slightly, her arms lie as close as may be to her torso, and the Child, by climbing up higher on her knees, and she herself, by the twist of her whole body, enrich the action, besides helping to achieve greater compactness of mass.

## X

Before quite leaving the Sacristy of S. Lorenzo, it were well to mention, if but briefly, two sheets at Lille and in the British Museum [Plate cxxxvii.] respectively, with drawings of masks and grotesque heads. Perhaps they were drawn with a view to this great enterprise. Now the grotesque holds in the figure-arts the place of humour in literature; and, as in literature, there is perhaps no quality rarer and more difficult to attain, so in art none more inaccessible than the genuine grotesque. This is not the place to speak of this fascinating theme, so often treated, yet



craving much more penetrating discussion. Suffice it to express my conviction that mastery in this domain furnishes the best of tests whether a given artist really is supreme. Michelangelo is, of course, a great lord in this kingdom. The various grotesque heads in the New Sacristy prove it, and further testimony is borne by these two sheets of drawings. They are not phantasmagoric, still less, one need scarcely add, are they products of quasi-mechanical piecing together. Like the best in the same kind by Leonardo and Mantegna, they are facetious states of mind, isolated and incarnate. Then, as plastic art—what qualities of modelling! In the Lille sheet there is a head diademed with a scalloped frill. You shall seek far and wide for its equal.

In one corner of the London sheet occurs a small, rapid sketch for a Hercules stifling Antæus. Now it is well known that ever since 1508 there lay waiting at Carrara a large block of marble out of which Michelangelo was to carve any two figures he pleased, to accompany his own David which stood by the entrance of Signoria. Whether, as Vasari states, Michelangelo at one time intended that these two figures should be Hercules and Cacus, may be questioned; at all events, I have been able to discover no drawing by the master for such a subject. On the other hand, there are several sketches for a Hercules and Antæus. This fact in itself would not be conclusive proof that this was the subject Michelangelo intended to treat in the huge block of marble; for, quite on its own account, a theme like this of two wrestlers must have interested him above all other sculptors. But it happens that a contemporary chronicle recording the vicissitudes and arrival of the marble-block at Florence on July 20, 1525, remarks\* that out of it Michelangelo was going to make a Hercules throttling Antæus, which, the chronicle adds, would have happened, if Pope Clement, eager that the work on the New Sacristy should not be delayed, had not allotted the marble to another sculptor. As we know, this was Bandinelli, and he certainly meant to make a Hercules and Cacus. It is, of course, possible that when Michelangelo, in 1528, got the block again, he found it already rough hewn for a Hercules and Cacus, and thereupon was obliged to accept that subject; but perhaps Vasari, who knew Bandinelli's finished group, and knew the story of his intrigues, took it as a matter of course that Michelangelo also had intended to treat the same motive. I should infer the contrary from Vasari's own statement that, seeing the condition in which Bandinelli had left the block of marble, Michelangelo decided to make out of it a Samson slaying two Philistines.

The theme of Hercules and Antæus, then, would seem to have occupied Michelangelo's attention a number of times, and of the drawings for this subject known to me, the earliest perhaps is the red chalk one in the Louvre [No. d'Ordre 709]. Here we see the two wrestlers struggling on terms still equal. Entwined as they are, it is hard to tell which is likely to vanquish. A tremulous but most efficient pen-study in the Malcolm Collection [No. 66], dated October 18, 1524,

\* Gaye, "Carteggio," ii. 464.

shows Hercules just beginning to get the advantage of his adversary, whom, however, he has not yet lifted from the ground. Both these treatments, while lacking no conceivable quality of mere action, leave much to be desired in the way of clearness, and compactness even, resulting from the crossing of the four legs. So we find in two other drawings Michelangelo inevitably returning towards Pollajuolo's conception of the theme, upon which it surely must have seemed hard to improve. Nor can it be said that, as action, Michelangelo even attempted to surpass his precursor, although he did go beyond him in compactness. One of the two sketches we have already glanced at on the sheet with the masques and grotesque heads in the British Museum. Hercules has lifted the giant off the ground and holds him, struggling and writhing, tight pressed between his diaphragm and arms. The same motive is carried farther in a small black chalk sketch at Haarlem [Teyler Museum 21A], where we see Antæus lifted still higher, and pressing still harder on the head of Hercules, and struggling still more hopelessly. That the theme did not cease to interest Michelangelo, even after all idea of executing it had vanished, we conclude from two sketches made by a pupil, perhaps under his own directions scarcely earlier than 1533 [Oxford No. 45 verso], and from a still later rapid scrawl of his own again at Haarlem [A. 31].

The Hercules and Antæus, as we have seen, were to give place to a Samson slaying a Philistine or Philistines. Just how many is not clear, for, in the *Life of Bandinelli*, Vasari tells us they were to be two, but in that of Pierino da Vinci they have been reduced to one—surely if not the more probable, at least, considering the block in question, the more desirable number. Unfortunately none of Michelangelo's remaining studies can clear up the question, nor convey an idea of the motive precisely as he meant to treat it. I know but one sheet of studies for a Samson slaying a Philistine [Oxford No. 69]. There we find six little sketches, each one seeking to improve upon the action and arrangement of the other. Not only, however, is their style of execution too far advanced for 1528—they probably were done a good ten years later—but the composition is always of the prostrate figure nearly full length and the Samson stooping low over him, thus forming an admirably compact triangular group, but one that never could have been carved out of the destined block. Two other sketches witness to the fact that, whether the idea of the marble group or whatever else may have been the cause, Michelangelo did turn his mind to the Hebrew hero—not to the conquering but to the vanquished. And how vanquished? By Delila. A slight outline study at the British Museum [No. 1859-6-25-553] shows him reclining, and Delila stealing up to him, he as vast as the Father Nile of antique sculpture and she hardly larger than one of the children clambering about that river god. Another study at Oxford larger and more elaborated although certainly not Michelangelo's, must yet have been enlarged, by Mini perhaps, and under the master's own eye, from some slight sketch of his. It exhibits the giant supinely reclining with shorn head,

while Delilah, even though dallying with him, is turning to make signs to her Philistine friends.

At about the same time, towards 1530 that is, Michelangelo painted his famous Leda. First intended for the Duke of Ferrara, but given finally to Mini, who was thereby to realise a fortune in the Eldorado of the Florentine artists, it entered the collection of Francis I., without, however, enriching poor Mini, who, like so many another intending *conquistador*, found a grave while expecting gold. At Fontainebleau it remained until the middle of the seventeenth century, when, according to common report, it was condemned to the flames as indecent. It is to be feared that this report must be true, for the only version that still lays claim to authenticity—the one in the National Gallery—neither corresponds to contemporary description nor to the well-known engraving with the monogram C. A. or C. B., nor to Mini's own specification that it was a *tavola*, that is to say, on panel. It has, moreover, an inferiority, even a pettiness, of quality which outweighs with me all other reasons for accepting it as Michelangelo's handiwork. Nevertheless, this work is not wholly lost for us. The engraving just mentioned produces a strong impression of being in essentials faithful. True, the reproducer is somewhat mincing, and evidently had a spirit more akin to Primaticcio's than to that of the great Buonarroti; yet we can attempt in our mind's eye to translate his work back, and we shall be helped in our effort if we give it the forms of the Night, and visualise the whole in colours not unlike those of the Doni Holy Family.

Unfortunately no drawing capable of throwing light on the creation of this marvellous masterpiece (for it could have been no less) is known to exist, nor indeed is there a sketch of any kind.

I cannot delay over the various studies for the Library of S. Lorenzo and its staircase, although such as are of convincing authenticity will be found duly entered in the catalogue. It is time we hastened on to that noble series of show-drawings either made for Tommaso Cavalieri or akin to them in spirit, style, and date of production.

## XI

This series, although done for the most part before Michelangelo's final departure from Florence, marks the beginning of a new manner in his draughtsmanship, which manner is by no means one of dotage—neither Michelangelo nor any other great draughtsman ever doted while drawing—although it is not altogether free from premonitions of old age and even senility. It is characterised at times by an over-elaboration of modelling, added to a certain nervelessness of touch and a prevailing carelessness in the finish of extremities, which make the designs of this manner dangerous guides to his style as a whole—guides all the more dangerous, as many of them are magnificently complete compositions, appealing both to the



academic and literary students of art. The smoothness, the deadness almost, so apparent to the discerning eye in many of them, will excuse one who takes them as a norm, for allowing many a turpitude to pass under the master's name; for, although even in these Michelangelo is ever Michelangelo, yet is he more easily imitated in this manner than in any other. Thus in the Uffizi there is a copy of the Ganymede so closely approaching the Windsor version that, but for a tradition miraculously well kept, which assigns it to its true author, Cristofano Allori, it also most certainly would pass for an original.

Of the individual drawings of this series, I have spoken at such length in the appended catalogue that here I can confine myself to brief statements of a more general order.

It must be remembered that most of these designs, even when others used them as models for cutting in crystal or for painting, were made by Michelangelo to be ends in themselves, finished works of art, and are therefore in a very different spirit from the drawings studied hitherto, all of which served an ulterior purpose. Whether a design gains by being made its own end is a subject for discussion. In no other form of art is there such a legitimate field for improvisation as in draughtsmanship—and to make sure that I am not misunderstood, I add that by draughtsmanship I do not mean in the first place, or even in the second or third place, correctness. I mean rather a certain incisiveness, a certain swiftness, a certain way of presenting the object, as it were, in mid-career, as if the contour rounded it off to the quick. Such draughtsmanship requires, in the first place, genius, and after genius, labour. A time comes to the genius who has toiled when toil can do little more for him, and he spontaneously draws as well as ever he can. His drawing is the fruit of a hand perfectly obedient to the eye, perhaps even of a free and *equal* union between eye and hand. Thus the great draughtsman is bound to reveal the utmost that he has in him at a given moment in any scrawl whatsoever, even though this scrawl have ever so little representative, illustrative value. The given moment may not be the artist's best; by making a fresh attempt he may hit upon a better moment and give a better representation of a certain object or objects than he did at first; but this fresh attempt must really be *da capo*, must, at the instant it is made, be as much the spontaneous resultant of the artist's whole personality as if he had never before attempted the subject.

If draughtsmanship is thus an art of improvisation, it follows that the best specimens of that art will be the least laboured, such as are done with the carelessness almost of breathing, those in which no ulterior motive could introduce any element of conscious painstaking. The highly elaborated, smoothly finished design is likely to be either a failure or an absurdity—a failure when the contours, through lack of spontaneity, have lost, as they surely will, their instantaneousness and sparkle; an absurdity when fully modelled, for then the attempt really ceases to be draughtsmanship, and becomes a kind of painting, a kind of pastel

painting. Drawing, then, as an art by itself, is one where the line predominates, where modelling should be procured as little as possible by chiaroscuro, as much as possible by contour. Light and shade are even more the assassins of pure drawing than our latter-day orchestras of pure music.

These old-fashioned views, if accepted too rigidly, might perchance do harm, but I mean to make no further use of them just here than to help to account for the fact that, as drawings, I should not place the Cavalieri and similar designs \* so high as they usually are placed, much though I value them for their depth of thought, for their arrangement, for their splendid action, for the exquisite beauty of many a single figure, and for the nearly constant perfection of the torsos. Nor are they all on quite the same level. The Three Labours of Hercules [Plate cxxxviii.] for instance, and the Gods Shooting [Plate cxxxix.], almost certainly of earlier date than the Cavalieri series, are by far the best of this kind. Indeed as a sort of—forgive the expression—pastel painting in red chalk I cannot readily conceive anything closer to perfection than the former of these. Surely nobler nude than this throttling the lion has been dreamt of but seldom. Yet, even here, there is something palsied in the extremities, dead in the touch, as in the lion's mane, for example. In the very first of the drawings done for Cavalieri, the Ganymede, there is a perceptibly diminished vigour of handling, and much less intrinsic beauty, apart from the sublime action and arrangement. Indeed it is only in the eagle's pinions that life still lingers. The wings are also what I find best in the justly famous Tityus, notwithstanding the magnificence of the torso and limbs of this noble nude. Perhaps the most fascinating is one of the last done for Cavalieri, the Children's Bacchanal. It not only represents a bacchanal of children, but is the bacchanal of the *putto* in Renaissance art. Yet beautiful as these sweet bodies are, and firm and solid no less than beautiful, I could wish the actual treatment of them gave me more pleasure, that there were more vitality of touch everywhere, that the flames, for instance, under the cauldron looked less like skeins of cotton.

None of these designs surely were struck off at once. There must have been preparatory studies, other stages of them, but, unhappily, I have not been able to find sketches relating to more than one of these finished designs. That one is the Fall of Phaeton, of which there remain three versions and part of a fourth, in various degrees of finish. As actual draughtsmanship, I take the greatest pleasure in the roughest of them, done in little more than outline, the sheet at Venice [No. 180]. But Michelangelo evidently was not satisfied with the arrangement, and in the two completer versions improved much on the composition, although he lost even more in vitality of touch. The final version, that of Windsor [Plate cxl.], is perhaps the smoothest, the most mannered of all his authentic drawings, and yet one would not be without it, for the lower part is one of the most beautiful mythologies of all time.

\* Unless otherwise specified the reader is to assume that they are all at Windsor.

While engaged upon this last series of drawings Michelangelo, we know not with what purpose, took up the subject of Christ's Resurrection.\* Two of the designs for this subject are contemporary with the earliest of the last series, and have the advantage of being less laboured. First we have a rapid red chalk sketch [Louvre, No. 112] in little more than outline, done in preparation for the magnificent design at Windsor [Plate cxli.], which design has the qualities and faults of the Three Labours of Hercules or the Gods Shooting, of the same collection. The action is in the highest degree dramatic. Christ rushes forth from the tomb more like an unconscious force than a victor over death, and the dismay of the guards is as if a thunderbolt had fallen in their midst. This boisterous treatment gave place in a year or two to the sublime design [British Museum, Plate cxlii.] wherein we behold Christ who soars up from His tomb like an emanation,—beautiful firm nude though he is—while the guards are startled into awe. Not only as visualised poetry, but as draughtsmanship also, is it a great achievement. Although not quite unspoilt by the mannerisms of this stage of the artist's career, it yet has a singular freedom, a wonderful tactfulness in the varying degrees of elaboration. The drapery, floating behind Christ, moulding and accentuating His form and highly effective in lending it substance, is a lesson for all time.

I know not why Michelangelo did not rest content with this treatment of the theme, but clearly he did not. Perhaps it gives too good an opportunity for a beautiful nude in unusual action for him to leave it before he had tried every attitude. On the back of the Tityus at Windsor [Plate cxliii.] we find something most curious. The Tityus, traced through the paper without any change, has been by the master himself arranged as a risen Christ holding His banner.† Then, in the same collection and of about the same date, there is the large single figure of the nude ephebe just touching the tomb from which, with arms spread out like wings, he is about to take flight. He is wholly nude, but a floating drapery does wonders here also in completing and framing in the figure. Finally we have the other nude Christ [Malcolm Collection, No. 64] with His right hand spread out, and the banner in His left, belonging to a later period when Michelangelo was already far advanced upon the Last Judgment. It is smoother, more palsied than the others, and has in type something of the brutality which is not absent from the figures in the master's last great work.

It was most probably just before leaving Florence in the autumn of 1533 that Michelangelo, whilst at work upon the two last series of designs, made for his life-long simpleton of a friend, Giuliano Bugiardini, that truly sublime sketch of a Martyrdom of St. Catherine [Corsini Gallery, Rome]. Here we see the great master at the acme of his strength, intellectual as well as manual. The architectural forms have the utmost majesty, while the arrangement, whether treatment of

\* In the seventeenth century there was at Forlì a small Resurrection by Marcello Venusti done on a design by Michelangelo (see "Gazette des Beaux Arts," Nouvelle Série xiii. p. 160). Nothing further of it is known.

† A more elaborated version of this sketch is in the British Museum [No. 1507A].



theme or decorative effect be considered, can scarcely be better conceived. Then the design is little more than in outline, has almost no light and shade, and is therefore not only free from the faults inherent in chiaroscuro drawing, but of a spontaneity, a vivacity, a sparkle of touch never surpassed by any of the master's earlier successes. This instance, by the way, of generosity to another artist was by no means unique. From the days of his first triumphs to the very end, Michelangelo was in the habit of thus helping out his friends and acquaintances, artists who wanted assistance, or employers who, knowing that he was too busy to do anything for them, yet did not hesitate to burden him with requests for designs to be executed by others. Contemporary records are rich in notices of such begging and of the master's compliance.\*

Before leaving this period let me mention the bare fact that an incomplete but interesting record remains of the "Noli me tangere" painted in 1531 on a cartoon of Michelangelo's by Pontormo. It is the sketch of a draped Christ in the collection of Mr. Clough. More concerning it will be found in the catalogue.

## XII

Vasari assures us that Clement intended there should be a great fresco on each end wall of the Sistine Chapel. The Last Judgment was commenced and finished, and despite the worst that the deliberate drapings and infamous restorations have done for it, there it still remains, a witness at least to Michelangelo's conception, a revelation of what in his old age had become of his art. The Fall of Lucifer, which was to cover the opposite wall, made so little headway that, but for Vasari, who speaks of sketches for this blighted enterprise, we should not know it ever had been contemplated. Of these sketches not one has weathered the ages, and indeed singularly few authentic drawings remain for the Judgment. But as we have no need of their help in arriving at the master's purpose—seeing that the fresco gives us this—we can better afford the loss of the others.

As for the sketches intended unquestionably for this work, they are, so far as I know, only six or seven. Each in its kind is among Michelangelo's best drawings, and, with but one exception, all are outline sketches full of spontaneity and vigour. The most detailed is one in black chalk at the Casa Buonarroti, perhaps the first jotting down of the composition as a whole. Intended only to mass the various groups, as a study therefore in mere arrangement, it offers no small discrepancies with the completed work. It would, perhaps, be difficult to descry with certainty any figures which occur in the one as well as in the other except those of Christ and the Virgin. We shall at the utmost discover an identity in two or three

\* I do not here allude to those late designs for the Crucifixion, Christ in the Garden, Christ driving the Money Changers out of the Temple, the Annunciation, etc., made as ends in themselves and painted by Marcello Venusti and others subsequently, or at Michelangelo's own request.

nudes tumbling out of Charon's boat, or in another on the left. But the general arrangement is already as good as fixed, with the essential difference, however, that this first sketch promises a work of greater clearness, unity and compactness, and of far more continuity of rhythm than that finally decided upon. Very beautiful in the first draft is the reaching out towards their Judge of all the masses in whom there yet is hope. Why did Michelangelo depart from this simpler and perhaps more effective scheme? Is it possible that, as the death of Clement put an end to all idea of ever painting the Fall of Lucifer, Michelangelo could not resist the temptation of introducing into the Judgment some of the groups and something of the spirit that he had hoped to give the former? Thus the sketch is of a Judgment and Damnation, with no sign of the painting's childish rebellious groups of the Damned hurled back by angels, which characterise mediæval treatments of the subject, but which I should have expected Michelangelo to discard.\*

Be this as it may, in another black chalk study of even better and altogether more admirable quality [Malcolm, No. 80, Plate cxliv.], we behold, besides more than one figure that was finally abandoned, a sketch for the group comprising the Martyrs, Sebastian conspicuous among them, as well as the Damned hurled down by the angels. But as this sketch was in its turn subjected to considerable changes, it would appear that the latter group got relatively early admittance into the composition. And be it noted that the changes are not necessarily for the better, so that one is inclined to suspect that at this time the artist's tact and judgment were beginning to fall behind rather than to improve upon his first thoughts.

In the upper part of this same Malcolm sheet occurs a torso with arms held out and clenched fist, remarkable for the way it has been drawn. It has been done with hard chalk in strokes consisting of curves, of curves as if of steel, yielding under pressure and then rebounding to hug close the object confined, which object here is the torso in question. Never perhaps has a way been invented better fitted to give each muscle, each swelling, its perfect contour. It is the ideal means of conveying with line, and nothing but line, all the sinuosities and the full modelling of powerful muscular structure. Instances of it may be found earlier, but as a method Michelangelo employed it only while working upon the Last Judgment, and even then, for reasons unknown, he used it but sparingly.

Although not for this work, a sheet in the British Museum [No. 1859-6-25-565], certainly of this time, is covered on both sides with sketches in this great and too rare manner. On the front we have among other studies, such as a Madonna seated with the Child reclining in her lap and a nude of less interest, a group of listlessly reclining and crouching figures—to be connected, perhaps,

\* Contemporary with this and of the same style and quality is a sketch in the Santarelli Collection of the Uffizi. It was intended for the upper right part of the composition, and like the Buonarroti design, proves that when Michelangelo drew it he had as yet no intention of effacing the frescoes in the two lunettes that he himself had painted more than a score of years before in connection with the Ceiling, and of using the space thus gained to give greater height to the composition of the Judgment. See Catalogue, under Michelangelo, Uffizi, Santarelli Collection.

with the Purgatorio of Dante, whose "Divina Commedia," if we may trust report,\* Michelangelo illustrated throughout. Far more interesting, however, are a number of heads, and two nudes on the back. Here, in hard chalk again, we behold such contours as give adequate form to mighty, adamantine beings. Surely this giantess with her steel-bound limbs can scarcely find her match in all the range of draughtsmanship.

For the Last Judgment, to which for a moment we must return, there are known to me at least two more studies worthy of special mention. One in black chalk at Haarlem [No. 13] is for the Lawrence, another in the same material at Windsor of a demon's head which, although it does not occur in identical form in the fresco, may have been a study for the demon beside Minos. As drawing this terrible head has all the faults of the more finished parts of the Cavalieri designs; but as a creation it rises above all power of description. If not here, where else shall we see the image of mad rage become flesh.†

## XIII

On December 25, 1541, the Last Judgment was unveiled. Perhaps even before that date, or at the latest soon after it, Michelangelo's manner of drawing merged into its final phase. Nearly another whole quarter of a century of life remained to him, and he did not pass it inactively. Within the year he began the frescoes in the Pauline Chapel. Later he was at work upon that noble "Pietà" which we now see in the choir of S. Maria del Fiore, unfinished as he left it. Further tasks did not fail to present themselves and to absorb him. He still made designs for friends, some, as those for Vittoria Colonna, to be an end in themselves. Yet if any of these were intended to be show-drawings they have perished, for of that kind nothing, that I know of, remains. But the various versions of a Crucifixion that still exist do not seem to make a series tending towards a culmination in some one design. On the contrary, each presents some slightly different phase of the same problem in arrangement and action. It would thus seem likely that, while the essential business of the great figure artist could and did still absorb Michelangelo, he no longer would attempt highly finished designs. Painting, drawing, and indeed even writing, were gradually growing painful to him. Of the Pauline frescoes he writes: "With regret shall I paint them, and I shall do regrettable things." Finally, in 1559, he confesses that "writing is very irksome to me, to the hand, to the sight, and to the memory. This is the way of old age."‡

\* Volkmann, "Iconografia Dantesca," Leipzig, 1897, p. 76.

† Among the many sketches that Michelangelo must have made for the Last Judgment, there is one above all others that I could wish had not been lost. Despite the keen interest in the master's portraits, and the many attempts to ascribe to him various existing images of himself, it has hitherto, so far as I know, escaped notice that, in the lower left hand corner of the fresco, we descry the nearly erect figure of Michelangelo mingling with the rising dead. Here and here only among his existing works of any kind has he portrayed himself. How precious would be the cartoon for this Head.

‡ Milanesi "Lettere," 490, 345.



If he drew at all, and he still did draw, and considerably, he no longer could have had the inclination to finish carefully. So most of his last sketches are hastily jotted down with soft black chalk, unlaboured, spontaneous, energetic. The hand trembles more and more, the outline grows less and less steady, but it never ceases to be significant. Nor does he even now in his extreme old age begin to work by rote. Thus, in his last years, as indeed always, although there is no startling variety in his types and attitudes, yet never is a figure done merely on a scheme. If one greatly resembles the other, it is because his interest lay in certain problems of balance and action. Ever seeking, step by step, to work out these problems, he was bound to create figures and attitudes which vary but slightly the one from the other. To the end, to the very end, the nude in action remained his dominant interest. When he drapes the nude, it is, as it always has been, only to give it more accent. But the nude itself he finally reduced to its essentials, to the torso namely. The perfect articulation of the torso, its full realisation as palpitating mass claimed, we may say, his very last breath.

It is not easy to ascertain in every case the purpose of the late sketches. Thus, while Oxford No. 77 was clearly for the Crucifixion of St. Peter, No. 60 [1, 2, 3] in the same collection is not so obviously connected with this fresco, for the attitudes occur already in the Judgment, and the loose handling would lead one to assign it to a slightly later date than the beginning of the Pauline frescoes. Before ending this last attempt of his at painting, which, as seems probable, dragged on till 1550, Michelangelo must have designed the sadly botched, scarcely recognisable and yet, as fortune would have it, sole cartoon that has come down to us. It is the famous composition in charcoal in the Malcolm Collection [No. 81] of nearly life-size figures for a Holy Family and Saints. Of the execution, the present state of the once noble work commands one to say little. Where it is least destroyed there are traces of vigorous handling. But the vision at all events may be described, and it is one of heroic forms, mighty torsos and heavy limbs. The motive, too, is most original. The Madonna, lightly seated, listens eagerly to the impassioned discourse of the Evangelist, while with one hand she silences Joseph. Of what is the Evangelist speaking? Perhaps of the Christ Child who, all unaware and unconcerned, is nestling roguishly at His Mother's feet, making believe that He will not play with the infant John. Such, at least, is my interpretation of this cartoon, so splendid besides as a composition, concerning which much might be said would space permit. But one other sketch for a Madonna remains to be noted, and it is worthy of note, a tremulous sketch in black chalk at the British Museum, done with a hand nearly crazy, but with no uncertainty of aim. We see the Mother, still of heroic form, draped and yet almost undraped—so clearly does the nude show through—stooping slightly as if to rock in her arms the Child who meanwhile has thrown His arms about her neck in an embrace—a motive as delicately tender as has ever been treated. Trembling as is the line, the form is

not lost. It has its due existence, and the action indeed could not well have been improved upon, even by Michelangelo himself.

## XIV

With one exception, such few drawings as it still behoves me to mention, group themselves about the themes of the Annunciation, Christ driving the Money Changers out of the Temple, Christ in the Garden, the Crucifixion and the "Pietà." None of these did Michelangelo himself attempt to execute in painting or even, to my knowledge—contrary to what is usually assumed—to elaborate into such highly finished designs as the sawdusty Annunciation and the Christ in the Garden which at the Uffizi are attributed to him.

The exception I have just referred to is as draughtsmanship perhaps the most interesting of Michelangelo's latest sketches. It is a study at the Casa Buonarroti for a Sacrifice of Isaac. Black chalk is used with a master's freedom, every touch telling, no fumbling, no indecision, nothing over elaborated and nothing omitted. The curves which make the contours are still a clear echo of those we found in a few great drawings of the Judgment period. I know no other sketch of Michelangelo's last years so worthy of himself, and so complete. Nor can I believe that in those same years he ever elaborated to a higher degree. A word on the treatment of the theme. On an altar as plain as only a square block can be, Isaac half kneels, his right foot stretched out, his right arm thrown over the bent knee of his father who, stooping over, knife in hand, finds his wrist seized by the angel. The Patriarch's head and beard are grandly framed in by the angel's outstretched arm, and an even finer bit of arrangement is the supple figure of the youth. There exists no other composition for the same subject worthy of a place beside it, and I think I do not exaggerate its value in placing it among the master's great achievements.

For the Christ and the Money Changers—a wretched painted version of which insults the eye at the National Gallery—there are in the British Museum various black chalk sketches of different sizes for the composition as a whole, and for parts, as well as a number of pen-scribbles at Oxford [No. 71] and in the Casa Buonarroti. There is good action in all of them, but little else to give pleasure. The pen-sketches interest me more than the others. They are Michelangelo's last in this kind, and yet such is their vigour that, as summary scribbles, you might at first sight mistake them for jottings for the Bathers, done some forty and more years earlier.

In 1545 Michelangelo designed for Vittoria Colonna a crucifix. From the description given by Condivi, it is clear that the original of this design has perished. Only wretched copies of it remain, as, for instance, the black chalk design at Oxford [No. 73]. But this design seems to have turned the master's

attention to the subject of Christ on the Cross, and although surely not for the first time, yet for the first time seriously. For the next twelve years he seems at intervals to have returned to this theme,\* and at least six of the studies then made and still existing deserve our notice. Even if it could be done, which I scarcely believe, I should not attempt to put these in chronological sequence, for that is a question of infinitesimal consequence here. It cannot be said that they show marked differences of manner, although some of them incline more toward the Judgment series and others more to the Malcolm cartoon. None of them are in any sense show-drawings. No attempt has been made, so to speak, to burnish them up. Yet if not so much in the touch, in the intention there is wavering, there is correction, there is even perplexity. What troubled the artist? I venture to believe that, as we shall see, it was not the religious interpretation of the motive.

Even more perplexed than most is the sheet at Windsor, wherein we see Christ on the cross, His legs close together, His torso bending sideways to the left, His head falling a little to the right, while below stand His Mother stooping and huddled up as if wringing tears out of herself, and John looking up. So full of *pentimenti* is the design that the artist's first intention almost disappears. It would seem that he began by putting on an ordinary cross a nude with arms stretched out horizontally, and in all but the head resembling the figure as made for Vittoria Colonna; the head, however, not as there looking up and "seeming to say 'Eli, Eli,'" but falling in death to the right. This did not satisfy Michelangelo, and no wonder, for the motive of the still living figure, holding itself up on the cross is, as a plastic or static motive, one of the worst conceivable, and could, I believe, have been selected by a great artist only upon some extraneous compulsion. In this Windsor design we see him beginning with the same motive, soon realising its absurdity and not beginning afresh but trying to mend what he already had. Thus he made the body relax more. Once, twice, and thrice he lifted the arms so as to make the torso depend from them. Yet even so the figure remains stiff and unexplained—better abandoned.

At this point perhaps Michelangelo realised that the problem he was bent upon solving was—to put it in language he certainly would not have used—how to have the figure nailed in such wise to the cross that it would convey ideated sensations, not of physical distress, but of physical relaxation and almost ambrosial repose—the only way in which plastic or graphic art ever should attempt to represent death. So, in another sketch at Windsor, we find the artist searching this new way, and here, not without fumbling, he finally settles down upon a torso falling almost vertically while the arms slant upwards. The torso is elaborated with most extraordinary search for its real build, as if the artist were but an eager neophyte first discovering it; but the motive is not yet satisfactory. The torso is not relaxed and limp enough, although the head is, and the legs are too far apart to suggest sufficient repose. Michelangelo carried the motive further. In one of the two

\* See note, p. 302, Symonds, ii.



Malcolm sheets for this subject [No. 72] we see the figure on a cross whose top is like a broad inverted **A**. At the inverted point comes the head, the arms stretch along the sides, while the torso and legs hang limp and compact down the shaft. The head is slightly sunk into the shoulders, the lovingly studied torso is almost completely relaxed, and seems to hang from the arms, the legs falling limp. And yet this design leaves room for improvement of the kind that we discover in another at the Louvre [No. 120]. Here the arms are stretched up more vertically, and the whole body hangs as relaxed and as much at rest as the position will allow. Without being, I dare say, aware of it, Michelangelo has solved in the same way the problem that was treated by the Greek sculptor who carved the famous hanging Marsyas.

Even then Michelangelo was not quite happy. Having exhausted the possibilities of the figure as hanging from the arms, he returns to try once more the less happy motive of the arms in a more or less horizontal position. He treated it first, perhaps, in the only red chalk drawing of this series [Oxford No. 72], wherein we see the head sunk deep into the shoulders, the torso protruding over the abdomen, the whole figure not so much reposeful as pathetic; and finally, in a last design, in many respects the most beautiful of all these designs, the other Malcolm sheet, wherein, although the arms are nearly horizontal, the figure is rhythmically relaxed, the head sunk gently on the right shoulder, while the two accompanying figures cling close to the cross. Granting the action, neither for arrangement, nor for delicate modelling, nor for sublime, calm repose could more, it seems to me, have been made of this theme.

## XV

To few artists so much as to Michelangelo could the kindred motives of the Deposition, the "Pietà," and the Entombment have been more precious. They give scope for the nude and for action, and permit the wise artist to study out exquisite arrangements, and to communicate to the spectator ideated sensations of almost blissful repose, which sensations in their turn cradle one in a pangless melancholy, an Uranian calm destined finally to transfigure the mere subject of the theme with the emotional colouring thus engendered. It is not surprising, therefore, that in the sixty years which elapsed between his undertaking the "Madonna della Febbre" and his abandoning the "Pietà" now at S. Maria del Fiore, Michelangelo returned frequently to these motives. The limp, dead figure of the Saviour relaxed in every muscle we find if not quite in the earliest, the "Madonna della Febbre," in the next, the Deposition of the National Gallery. But here the Saviour's perfect repose is perhaps too violently contrasted with the over strenuous exertion of the figures that support Him. Two magnificent black chalk drawings, the one in the Louvre [No. 125, Plate cxlv.], and the other in Casa Buonarroti, of somewhat earlier date than the Deposition, are of a Dead Christ reclining, pre-

sumably on His tomb, doubtless for a composition of the Dead Christ supported on His tomb by angels (as Signorelli and the Venetians have painted Him) or by His disciples. In one of these designs the head falls in perfect rest on the shoulder, the arms are completely relaxed, the whole figure yielding itself to be supported.\* On the back of the study at the British Museum for the lovely nudes on the Sixtine Ceiling is another study in charcoal, rapid but not hasty, for another Dead Christ in somewhat more erect position. On the front of another sheet also done perhaps in connection with the Ceiling [Louvre, No. 122], we find a superb study of three nudes swinging forward and staggering under the load of the Dead Christ whom they carry, His body weighing down the shoulders of the two behind, His legs falling over both sides of the head of the one in front. Here, however, we get heroic action only, a study in movement. With difficulty, if at all, could a finished work have grown up on this as a framework.

For many years after this I find no sketch from Michelangelo's own hand that would lead us to infer that he was still busy with these themes. That he was, there can however be no doubt, for the several designs done by Sebastiano del Piombo between 1515 and 1530, all of which indeed still pass unquestioned as Michelangelo's own, bear strong witness to the latter's direct influence, and even counsel; while, in the next design for a "Pietà" by the master himself we find strong proof that he stood behind Sebastiano when he, Sebastiano, was planning out his "Pietà" for Viterbo. The original design I have in mind, the one described by Condivi as done for Vittoria Colonna has, so far as I know, perished, but it has been preserved for us in Giulio Bonasoni's faithful engraving. Now this is dated 1546, and there can be no doubt that the original was made only a few months earlier. Yet who will look at the action and even the type of the Madonna here and question her resemblance to the Virgin in the Viterbo altar-piece? Unless we take refuge in the absurdity that this most Michelangelesque figure was invented by Sebastiano, we must grant that it was given him by Michelangelo. As to this design for Vittoria Colonna we find therein a complete change in the treatment of the theme. No longer action of an almost over heroic, unmitigated kind, but instead repose-infusing relaxation, and exquisite compact arrangement. The dead Saviour, with head drooping, seated on a low ledge, reclines against His Mother's lap, from which he would slip away if two boy angels did not support Him by the elbows. She looks up to the heavens with her arms held out. You feel the helpless limpness of the dead figure, and the full support given Him by the sturdy boy angels. As a merely decorative arrangement of a mass it cannot easily be too much admired.

On one side of a sheet belonging to the Hon. A. E. Gathorne Hardy we find two figures in almost the precise attitude of the boy on the right in the last design, and on the other a sketch for a Deposition. The date of this sheet cannot therefore be much, if at all, later than 1546. Now, although these

\* Oxford No. 12 offers a rapid note for some such figure done from the model.

sketches are not the master's own, but by some charming follower, yet they may count for the treatment of the motive as if they were Michelangelo's. It is a beautiful group of eight figures, four sustaining between them on their arms the dead Christ, two heads vaguely visible behind, and brooding over all, at the foot of the cross, the mourning Mother, seeming, as it were, about to embrace the world in her outstretched arms. Here we must not expect the weight and support that Michelangelo himself would have given. The value of the sketch lies in its perfect arrangement. It is the latter quality which we miss, for it is not even aimed at, in a strip of rough black chalk sketches by the artist himself, which would seem to have been the foundation whereon Mr. Gathorne Hardy's design was built [Oxford No. 70 (1)]. Michelangelo doubtless received his impulse for this as for the other studies of scenes connected with the Passion from Vittoria Colonna, and the quasi-pietism wherewith she inspired him. Indeed, Condivi tells us as much. But while pietism may dictate the motive, it cannot affect the real artist's treatment. This the real artist will always derive from the eternal laws of his craft. Thus on the Oxford strip no attempt as yet is made at arrangement, but we see five studies for the Dead Christ supported by one or more figures. In two, we see His dead weight sustained in sitting posture with head drooping forward on the joined hands of two nudes, with His arms falling around their necks. In the other three, He is kept from slipping down by one figure holding Him under the arms. These last three sketches do, of course, vividly recall the Rondanini marble\* for which they nevertheless may not be considered as studies. What was the precise object of these notes? Was it some larger design for Vittoria, or were they groupings toward that culmination of all the master's efforts in this direction, the sublime group now at Florence on which he was working in the years before and after 1550? In this last great achievement he realises nearly to perfection his almost constant striving for the utmost action compatible with the least change of place and in the compactest mass. And here, as an added quality beyond all that we find elsewhere, even beyond his achievements at S. Lorenzo, an ambrosial repose transfused to us from the limp, gliding, yet tenderly supported figure.

Another and kindred strip of sketches [Oxford No. 70 (2)], dating no doubt from the same year as the last, contains various studies for a Christ in the Garden. That Michelangelo made a design for this subject we not only could infer from the various Michelangelesque paintings of it still existing,† but we know from Vasari's statement that he had seen such a design, which, along with another for the Annunciation executed by Marcello Venusti for the Lateran, had been given by Lionardo Buonarroti to Duke Cosimo.‡ In fact, two large studies for these

\* Is not, by the way, this marble the one thus described in the inventory made upon Michelangelo's death, of the contents of his house in Rome?—"statua principiata per un Cristo ed un'altra figura di sopra, attaccata insieme, sbozzata e non finita." Gotti, "Michelangelo," ii. 150.

† The best of them to my knowledge is the version in Casa Balbi-Piovera at Genoa.

‡ Vasari, vii. 272.



subjects may still be seen in the Uffizi, and do, I believe, still find worshippers.\* But I cannot for a moment admit that these smooth, infinitely academic, lifeless figures with shining skins could at any moment of his career have been done by Michelangelo himself. I would suggest that they are by Marcello Venusti—finished studies done after such sketches by the master as those at Oxford for the *Agony*, and under the master's eye and guidance. Nor, were it firmly established that these designs are the precise ones seen by Vasari, would that change my opinion. Possibly they were left by Venusti with Michelangelo, and upon the latter's death would naturally have been taken for his own work. The difference, after all, is only of quality, and we know how easily that escapes notice.

Marcello Venusti, as we are aware, painted after Michelangelo's designs two Annunciations, both for Cardinal Cesi, one for the Lateran and the other for the Pace. The second has disappeared, but small versions of it exist by Venusti himself, as for instance, in the Corsini Gallery at Rome. Now for this version also there is, or was, a highly finished study by the same hand certainly as the one that did the design at the Uffizi. What has become of this study I know not,† but it was in Sir Thomas Lawrence's Collection and is reproduced in Woodburn's "*Lawrence Gallery*." I would ask the student to look at this excellent reproduction and decide whether the original, on its own merits, with no grand old authorities to guarantee it, could possibly be taken for Michelangelo's own. But I repeat it is by the same hand that did the Uffizi version.

Three sketches by Michelangelo for an Annunciation do however exist. In the earliest, recently acquired by the British Museum, which, to judge by its character could scarcely date after 1545, we have a splendid study for the Virgin only. She is a stately figure, about to kneel at her high faldstool on which her right hand already holds her prayer-book, when the angel's voice makes her turn to right with a twist of the whole body, such as we expect from the seeker for contraposto. Now it may scarcely be doubted that this fine figure was intended for the Lateran picture, for which Marcello Venusti's finished study may be seen passing under the great master's name in the Uffizi; but its contraposto was apparently too simple for Michelangelo, and hence the final decision for the more violent start, and the wrench of the torso. The result may be more interesting; more beautiful, or even as beautiful, certainly not. In the next [Malcolm No. 78] we see the Virgin sitting with her right arm on a table, her left held up in amazement while the angel hovers close to her. Although it would seem later, the action of this group is in the spirit of the Annunciation done probably for the Pace. In this and the third sketch, the artist attempts to get out of a motive to him not very tractable what movement and compactness he can, but with no signal success. The last study for an Annunciation is probably the very last drawing from

\* Professor Wickhoff, for instance, in his "*Wiener Genesis*."

† Since writing the above I have discovered this drawing in the collection of Sir Charles Robinson, which I was privileged to see, thanks to the kindness of Messrs. Agnew.

Michelangelo's hand that we now possess. For reasons given in the appended catalogue, it can be dated no earlier than 1556. The composition is quite in the traditional style. Almost as in Lorenzo Monaco, for instance, the Virgin sits at her desk with her face in profile, one hand on the desk, the other held up while the angel floats towards her. The drawing is tremulous and vague, yet the artistic purpose is still luminously clear. The solidity of form, the weight of the limbs, and a certain majesty of conception are not only sought but easily obtained by Michelangelo, although he had now passed his eightieth year.

## CHAPTER X

### MICHELANGELO'S IMMEDIATE FOLLOWERS AND SUNDRY FORGERS

"**P**AULO *minora canam.*" It now behoves us to leave the arduous but inspiring peak where we have stood face to face with a man of might, and descend to much humbler levels and meaner tasks. The student who happens to have acquaintance with the bulk of the drawings ascribed in even famous collections to Michelangelo, will have been surprised, perhaps, to find neither in what I hitherto have written nor in the appended catalogue any reference to many a renowned sheet known to him.

Many a renowned sheet, and among them some the most showy, and others the most attractive, still passes under the great master's name, although his hand knew them not. Now the lame and lazy school of criticism once regnant and at present slowly retiring with sneers only as weapons to cover its retreat, would consider its task ended in declaring that certain things were by Michelangelo, and certain others were not. But I shall not easily be sneered out of my conviction that it never is perfectly safe to take a given work away from one artist until we see what other may have done it—and, if for no other reason, then because we seldom penetrate deeply enough into the characteristics of anything until we try to interpret it in the light thrown upon it by the species to which we suppose it to belong. Thus we may have the strongest feeling that a given design is not by the Michelangelo we know. Yet it has much of him. May it not be his, in some further phase? We can never be quite sure until we see clearly that it is, in fact, by another master. Then, and then only, is all doubt removed, and instead of an uneasy state of mere hesitation, we attain to the moral certainty that not Michelangelo's are the really significant characteristics of a given design, but Sebastiano's, Bandinelli's, Montelupo's, or even Passerotti's or Manfredi's.

Unfortunately I am not so well equipped as one might be for the task of ascribing to each separate owner the almost staggering mass of sketches still attributed to Michelangelo. I could unassisted venture to cope with his immediate followers and imitators. But he was copied, he was imitated, he was even forged by such Bolognese and other mannerists as the Carracci, Passerotti, Manfredi,



Calvart, and Cambiaso, craftsmen with whom, until the other day, I had almost no acquaintance. Left to myself, it probably never would have occurred to me to seek among these for the authors of the Oxford Sibyls and Ghostly Anatomy, or for the famous Mariette "Hand." Happily there was found a student whose encyclopædic interest embraced even these mannerists, and it is due to him, Professor Franz Wickhoff, that I have been able to include them also within the compass of my efforts to redistribute *suum cuique*. To him my gratitude here, and I shall not fail to repeat my thanks at every particular instance. Happily the mass of the more famous imitations were done by Florentines, and the most famous of all—so famous, indeed, that some of them have never yet been suspected of being other than Michelangelo's greatest and best—by a Venetian. Partly to break the fall from the supreme artist to the rabble by dwelling first upon a man who himself was a great, if not a greatest master, and in part also because my own former as well as more recent special studies should have peculiarly fitted me to speak of a Venetian who fell under Florentine influence, I shall ask the reader at this point to examine with me the drawings that I think should be ascribed to Michelangelo's ablest follower, Sebastiano del Piombo.

## I

For some time past it has been an open secret that the loosely handled, fumbling red chalk sketch at the British Museum for Lazarus and two of the attendants who keep him in a still dazed condition, erect upon his tomb, could not be by Michelangelo, but must be a study by Sebastiano himself for his well-known Resurrection of Lazarus, ordered in January 1517, and finished on May 1, 1519.\* As this attribution to Sebastiano is now accepted by all serious critics, let us, following out the method of proceeding from the more to the less certain, begin with the sketch in question, seeing, in the first place, what confirmation his indisputable paintings give to this attribution, and then what peculiarities we may therein discover to help us to identify the same hand in other drawings ascribed to Michelangelo.

We note in both the attendants' hands very prominent, almost monstrous, forefingers. In the paintings we should expect to find such an exaggeration softened down yet apparent. And find it we do, not only in Sebastiano's later works, wherein it becomes more and more prominent, but as a mannerism taken over from Giorgione, in pictures painted in his earlier, purely Venetian phase: thus, in the St. John of the S. Crisostomo altar-piece; in the Magdalen belonging to Sir Frederick Cook; and in more than one hand in the Uffizi Death of Adonis. This last painting offers, in the hand of the Venus and in that of the oldest of the attendant women, a very close parallel to the lowest hand in our sketch, which in all three cases appears to be an almost unarticulated block rough-hewn into the

\* Frey's "Lettere a Michelagnuolo," 58, 143.

semblance of thumb and forefinger. In roughest form we shall find this of frequent occurrence in drawings by Sebastiano ascribed to Michelangelo. Another feature in our sketch for Lazarus is his sharp pointed nose, almost as in Palma, which we find not only in pictures like the Louvre Visitation but in the Death of Adonis already cited.

There are thus in this scrawl various traits peculiar to Sebastiano even before he fell under the influence of Michelangelo, traits, moreover, never characteristic of the last-named master. These, on top of the qualitative consideration that Michelangelo could never have drawn in this way, and certainly not as early as 1517, on top of the inherent probability that the author of the painting was the author also of the sketch, so identical with it in many ways—all these considerations, I say, mount up to a moral certainty that Sebastiano was responsible for this study. That being so, let us note what further peculiarities it affords. In the first place, the very loose handling, and the shading with parallel strokes. The hands have been already noted, particularly the claw-like forefinger of the upper attendant. Finally, the curious spindle-like leanness of the leg above and below the knee. Let us bear these in mind, for, although æsthetically and spiritually most trivial, they are scientifically of considerable importance.

There is in the British Museum yet another red chalk study for the same three figures, wherein the Lazarus is much more carefully drawn, much closer to Michelangelo. Yet Morelli already ascribed this also to Sebastiano, and correctly, for, except the Lazarus, the rest of the sketch is worked in the same loose, flickering, somewhat aimless way, and shaded with the same parallel strokes that we found in the first drawing. Here, moreover, we discover a strange peculiarity, which Professor Wickhoff, in discussing this and two or three other drawings by Sebastiano, has not failed to note, namely, the monstrous excrescence on the ankle-bone of the lower attendant.\* It is amusing to observe that the draughtsman was well aware that this was a fault, for he repeats the same foot four times, although without great improvement. This trick must also be noted and remembered, for it is one of the hounds we shall send forth to run down Sebastiano's drawings.

Having finished the Raising of Lazarus, Sebastiano returned to the frescoes at S. Pietro in Montorio, upon which, off and on, he toiled and moiled for six more years. No wonder, when we bear in mind that this easy-going, pictorially minded, sensuous Venetian tried to put on the armour and wield the weapons of such a giant as Michelangelo, to convert his own flickering, shallow, sparkling vision into the firmly fixed, inexorably limned, mighty images of the abstractest of all great artist-seers! What violence he must have done to his nature, what battles must have been waged between temperament and purpose! The principal subject of these frescoes is the Flagellation. The completed work, while not failing to betray its Venetian author, is severely composed, clearly determined, above all things—as we

\* "Jahrbuch," xx. p. 207.

should expect from a Michelangelesque inspiration—a study of the nude in action. But the Malcolm Collection preserves a red chalk sketch [No. 63, Plate cxlvi.] in preparation for this work, Michelangelesque enough in the nudes, but as a composition treated, as Professor Wickhoff already has observed, in the broad, story-telling Venetian manner. The extension in breadth, with Pilate enthroned on the left and a woman with a child on the right, does indeed remind us of such Giorgionesque canvases as the Glasgow Christ and Adulteress and Mr. Ralph Bank's Judgment of Solomon—both of which, indeed, as I hope to be able to demonstrate on a favourable occasion, were painted by Sebastiano before leaving Venice. When submitted, as surely this sketch was, to the great Florentine, he must have dismissed it as a tale told for children, and he must have urged Sebastiano to reduce it to the essential, to leave out all but the necessary nudes and the enframing architecture. I know of no study for the ultimate version as a whole, but in the same collection one may see a sketch for the final pose and action of the Christ [No. 366]. So unmistakably not Michelangelo's is it, that it was already ascribed to Sebastiano by Sir Charles Robinson. For us just here it is of small service, yet note in this figure also the leanness over the knee that we remarked in the Lazarus. Returning now to the study for the composition as a whole, we shall not fail to observe here again the loose handling, the parallel strokes for the shading, the lean shanks and the excrescent ankle-bones that we found in the sketches already examined. Here, moreover, the slenderness and height of some of the figures invite attention, and a certain tendency on the part of some of the legs to taper off into almost nothing before they reach the feet.

Now, as surely as the design for the Flagellation is not Michelangelo's but Sebastiano's, so surely is the large red chalk study in the British Museum for a Crucifixion by the same author. In spirit it is much closer to the greater master: the figures on the crosses are each a most Michelangelesque motive; but the handling, the mannerisms, the tricks are unmistakably, as Professor Wickhoff and Morelli have observed before me, the same as in that. The same loose touch, the same parallel strokes, the same disproportionate length of the figures, the same legs, either spindle-shanked, or tapering off into nothing, or with huge ankle-bones. Then the horses! They surely betray the Child of the Lagoons.\*

In the Albertina at Vienna there is a red chalk study for a Dead Christ and a number of figures supporting Him or mourning over Him. In former times it used to be ascribed to Andrea del Sarto, and even Schiavone and Parmigianino; and these last two names in a certain sense are more happily applied to this design than Michelangelo's, which, with high approval, it now bears. The Florentine would infallibly have treated this subject as a study in weight and support. Rapidly as he might have done it, he would have jotted down no limb which did

\* Sebastiano must have seriously intended painting a Crucifixion or Deposition; for two other remarkable sketches both ascribed to Michelangelo exist; at Sir Charles Robinson's for the former, and at Haarlem for the latter. Space forbids my discussing them here, but they are duly treated in the catalogue.



not serve this purpose, still less sketched out whole figures which do nothing, or worse than nothing, while forming part of the same compact group. Not only is the dead figure badly constructed, but it is too boneless and limp for artistic treatment, there being apparently no part of it which does not require separate outside support. And of this support it gets little if any, except by way of flourish and alarum. The author of this sketch had of course seen studies by Michelangelo for this theme, but had so little understood their purpose that he supposed it to consist in a *pêle-mêle* of figures and limbs of any proportions, any attitudes, any shapes, provided they formed an agitated mass.

No, that was not Michelangelo's way of conceiving this theme, nor is the loose, slovenly handling his way of drawing. The drawing is Sebastiano's. His is the shading with coarse parallel strokes, his the absurd length of such figures as the one on the extreme right, his the excrescent ankle-bone, and his most characteristically such a hand as Christ's right.\* Furthermore, I invite the student to compare the almost fainting, cowering female here in the lower left hand corner with the one kneeling to support the Madonna in the sketch for the Crucifixion; to note the strong resemblance between the leaning head on the right and the head of the lower attendant in the looser sketch for the Lazarus; and to observe the saucer eyes in this same sketch, and see how exactly they are matched in our "Pietà."

Unfortunately I have never seen either Sebastiano's "Pietà" at St. Petersburg, or the one painted for Ferrante Gonzaga and now at Ubeda in Andalusia.† The sight of these two works, doubtless, would give one not only much support in the attribution of this and other studies for the "Pietà" to Sebastiano, but also much assistance in determining their exact purpose and date. But here and now we shall have to do what we can without them. Happily trained eyes, a proper method, and patient industry can achieve something of themselves.

At Oxford there is in the University Galleries an effective red chalk design [No. 37] for a Dead Christ supported by various figures, of a treatment so very pictorial that it should long ago have roused doubts regarding its attribution to Michelangelo. The first and last impression produced by this sheet is that a painter, and a painter pure and simple, and none but a painter, could draw in this way, with such instinctive recurrence to light and shade, with such feeling for chiaroscuro as a controlling principle of composition. No, this study is not by a sculptor such as Michelangelo, although it long has passed and still does pass unquestioned for his work. It is, in fact, by the same hand that drew the Albertina sketch; it is by Sebastiano who, this time, having learned by his last experience, is

\* Exactly the same hand, and indeed arm, but in reversed position, as that of the lower attendant in the looser British Museum sketch for the Lazarus. Note, moreover, that the hand with which the tall female touches Christ's breast is the same hand wherewith Elizabeth touches the Virgin in the Louvre study for a Visitation [No. 235], which study, ascribed to Sebastiano, is certainly by him, and, so far as I know, has never been attributed to another.

† Mr. Earle Drax has a triptych [No. 497] on the central panel of which there is a fine Deposition, and on the side-panels a Betrayal and a Christ in Limbo. It is a faithful copy after a Sebastiano unknown to me, dating from about 1520-1525. The future biographer of the fascinating Venetian eclectic should make note of this.

considerably less wild, and somewhat more intelligent in his appreciation of the motive. The almost colossal Dead Christ is upheld by five or six figures, two of whom, stooping forward, embrace his thighs, while the others hold him from behind or at the side. He is heavy enough, but scarcely any real feeling of support is conveyed, and in lieu thereof much gesticulation. The handling is, on the whole, loose, as in the Albertina sketch, and in places it is quite aimlessly scrawly. The arms of the dead figures are in both drawings badly attached, and in both end with the same substitute for a hand. Of the same character, so peculiar to Sebastiano, is the Magdalen's hand in the Oxford sheet. Her draperies also are characteristic of Sebastiano, being unfunctional, and not interpreting the nude, as of course Michelangelo's would have done, but rare and schematic, as they frequently occur in Sebastiano.\* Nor must we despise certain more obvious resemblances between the two studies. Thus, at Oxford the arm of the man on our right is modelled in the same uncouth way as the arm of the fainting Virgin at Vienna, and in both compositions at the very top the identical head appears. Finally I would recommend the student who wishes to know how rapidly, how freely Michelangelo could treat such a theme, and yet draw in no fashion essentially resembling this, to look at his sketch for a Dead Christ carried on the shoulders of three nudes [Louvre, No. 122]; which sketch, drawn as the Ceiling was being completed, I suspect Sebastiano must have known and studied, and done his best to imitate.

Three further studies for a "Pietà" by Sebastiano, but still passing under Michelangelo's name, and, so far as I am aware, passing unquestioned, now call for attention. One of them, at Christ Church Library, Oxford, is for the sublime masterpiece at Viterbo, where, if at all, the project has been realised of combining Florentine grandeur of design with the poetry of Venetian colour. How much there is here of Michelangelo we see in the calm reposeful figure of the Saviour, and in the action, and even in the type of the Madonna. Yet, as we could have inferred from our study of the sketches for the Raising of Lazarus, and as, indeed, we know from the correspondence that passed between Michelangelo and Sebastiano, it was not the latter's intention merely to colour cartoons prepared by the former. All that he seems to have wanted was a general sketch, and then more or less guidance and correction while preparing his own cartoons, that is to say, while striving to come as close as he could to Michelangelo without ceasing to be Sebastiano.† Thus, in the Christ Church sheet we see him laboriously repeating

\* An excellent instance is his large black chalk study in the Louvre for a Visitation [No. 235], where the long-drawn folds of the Virgin are singularly like those of the Magdalen here. I should add that wherever similar folds occur in the lunettes of the Sistine Ceiling, they are a proof that those parts were not executed by Michelangelo himself.

† Vasari says expressly (v. p. 569) in connection with the Flagellation, that Michelangelo furnished a small drawing upon which Sebastiano based his larger studies. Perhaps during the honeymoon of their acquaintance there was actual talk of the latter's merely colouring cartoons of the former. Indeed on March 1, 1517, Sebastiano gets Sellajo to ask Michelangelo to furnish him such a cartoon (Frey, "Briefe an Michelagnolo," p. 63). Certainly among the Venetian's known pictures none can be said to have been painted on this very simple and soulless method. Yet it must have got noised abroad that he was willing to work in this way, and there is more than one mention of it in contemporary records. So late as June 19, 1529, a Bolognese writes to Michelangelo proposing that the latter should make a cartoon for him, and Sebastiano colour it. *Ibid.* p. 298.

time and again in slightly varied attitudes, on direct inspection perhaps of the model, the figure that was to serve as the Dead Christ. He even endeavoured to get the contours in the continuous Florentine way. Then the right arm troubled him, would not lie relaxed, and he repeats it thrice separately, and each time the fingers grow more and more spidery, until finally in the topmost sketch the middle fingers have grown as long and slim as roots. These spidery and yet not feeble hands are a mannerism which will have struck students in such famous and authenticated works by Sebastiano as the Raising of Lazarus (Christ's hand), the Naples Holy Family (Madonna's), or the portrait of Andrea Doria (Prince Doria, Rome), and is, indeed, so peculiarly characteristic that we may regard it as one of our greatest helps in recognising among Michelangesque drawings Sebastiano's authorship.

Another of these studies for a "Pietà" is one in red chalk again at the Albertina [S.R. 137]. The motive is not unlike the one treated many years later by Michelangelo himself in the Rondanini group, the Dead Christ upheld by His Mother, with the difference that here He is seated so that His whole weight does not have to be supported. The greater master would scarcely have left the arms dangling stiff and unrelaxed, nor have made the torso so long and rectangular. Characteristic of Sebastiano here are the head of the Christ, the head of the Virgin, the thin forearms, the right hand of the dead figure, and the niggling yet loose handling.

This brings us to the last and by far the most famous of studies for a "Pietà," which, although universally ascribed to Michelangelo, are, I believe, by Sebastiano. It is as a composition and even as a drawing a masterpiece, and bearing such proof as it does of the artist's exemplary industry, goes far to account for his notoriously slow execution. Every work of his was the product of a struggle to reconcile and harmonise with his Venetian temperament and habits the high ideals of form and statics held up to him by the great Florentine. In the first of the Albertina studies for a "Pietà" we found Sebastiano not even beginning to understand what his master's purpose was, and consequently producing that singular, aimless tangle of torsos and heads and limbs. In the design recently acquired from the Warwick Collection by the British Museum [Plate cxlvii.], the motive is treated with an intelligence that Michelangelo himself could scarcely have surpassed.

The Virgin seated on the ground, nearly fainting, is herself supported by the eager figures clustering around her, pushing forward toward the Saviour's body which lies in her lap. His torso almost curves over her raised right knee, while His head falls back and His right arm hangs down, dragging on the ground. His left leg falls over the raised knee of the half-kneeling woman who nestles up close to the Virgin. The grouping is so clear and yet so compact, that it admirably exemplifies Michelangelo's ideal of the greatest action with the least change of position, taking place in the smallest space that will yet leave everything lucid and perspicuous. The Christ would be difficult to surpass as a motive, the nude being



exhibited in a way that allows for the greatest clearness of structure and movement, while yet remaining relaxed in complete repose. Altogether praiseworthy, again, are the figures which support the fainting Virgin, not because mindful of her, but huddling up to her out of sheer eagerness to get nearer to her Son. Then there is over the whole an air of noble solemn pathos not without tenderness.

Though dull and uneloquent, what I have just said will suffice at least to prove that I do not fail to appreciate this wonderful design; and yet, although in every touch I recognise the artist who has been as it were made over by Michelangelo, nowhere do I discover Michelangelo himself. The handling is far too loose. There is an instinctive recurrence to pictorial effects of light and shade, and a singular want of contours—I mean not merely limiting, but functioning, modelling outlines. Then the proportions of the Christ are given by a man to whom the human figure was an object so little to be respected that he does not hesitate to pull it out to any required length. Thus, in the larger Vienna "Pietà," there is at least one figure whose proportions were determined by the artist's feeling that it must reach from the top to the bottom of the composition. In the British Museum design for a Crucifixion, the prostrate Virgin is made long enough to measure out a proper base for a triangular group. And so, in this most noble "Pietà," the Christ lies athwart the entire sheet, his head barely contained on the left, while on the right, although his legs are by no means stretched out, there is no room on the paper for his feet. Then these legs are thin and spindly at the knees, curving in there, as if to witness that the master who taught Sebastiano to draw them thus was not Michelangelo, but his first teacher in far-away Venice, Cima da Conegliano. Still more characteristic of Sebastiano are the only visible hands. The upper one is the spider-like affair that we find identical in the portrait of Andrea Doria; the lower one is rather more of the kind that we noted in the sketches for the Raising of Lazarus, and in the Christ Church sheet of studies for a "Pietà." The Virgin is of no Michelangelesque type, but has the almost Giorgionesque domed cranium, and the refined but sharp features peculiar to Sebastiano. The nearest parallel to her head is the head of the Madonna in Sebastiano's Holy Family with a Donor, formerly in the Northbrook Collection and now at the National Gallery. The folds of her draperies are long-drawn and schematic, exactly as in the Louvre study for a Visitation [No. 235]. With the face by the Virgin's I must beg the student to compare the one leaning against the knee of the tall figure in the Albertina "Pietà" [S.R. 136]; and with the profile of the woman eagerly stretching out her arm, the profile of the same tall figure in the same drawing. In short, there is not a square inch of this Warwick "Pietà" which could not be demonstrated to be Sebastiano's. But I have said more than enough, my excuse being that, even at the risk of becoming prolix and obvious, one must attempt to sustain one's opinion when, in connection with such an important work of art as this, it happens to be at variance with what is currently accepted.

Happily among the other studies and sketches still ascribed to Michelangelo which I believe to be by Sebastiano, there are three in the attribution of which I do not stand alone. Working independently, Professor Wickhoff and I have reached the same conclusion, that one Madonna at Windsor, another at Venice, and a head of Leo X. at Chatsworth are all by Sebastiano, and not by Michelangelo. Strong in Professor Wickhoff's support, I feel the less need of defending these "transfers of artistic property"; yet a few words cannot be out of place.

After the Warwick "Pietà," the Windsor Madonna [Plate cxlviii.] is certainly Sebastiano's finest design. Wrapped majestically in a mantle she sits with her right knee raised, her legs placed a little sideways to the left, the Child in her arms with His left hand about her neck. On the right stands the infant John, a little roguishly, by himself, but an essential part of the group, necessary to complete the pyramidal effect on his side. Here, as in the "Pietà," we see a plastic motive treated by a pictorial talent. Here, also, Sebastiano cannot resist the play of light and shade. Here also his draperies are schematic. Note the folds, without as much as an attempt at relief, stretching from the shoulder to the arm. The Madonna's head is of the type we know in the Magdalen in the Raising of Lazarus, of the type of more than one figure in the Birth of the Virgin at S. Maria del Popolo, or, indeed, of the head on our extreme right in the last "Pietà." Her upper hand has the spider-leg fingers of Doria's portrait; her lower is like the Christ's hand in the last drawing, or the hands in the sketches for the Lazarus. Her eyes are peculiarly heavy-lidded, a constant occurrence in Sebastiano. The Child is of a rather Venetian character, almost as of the putti in Titian's Assumption, but we find him closer at home, soft-eyed, with lovely curls, in the Child of Piombo's Holy Family with the Donor at the National Gallery. By his excrescent ankle-bone the infant is as good as stamped with the seal of Sebastiano.

The drawing at Venice, though not so grandly simple, is otherwise not less beautiful, and it is even more Michelangesque, being indeed but a variation on certain of that great master's Sibyls or groups in the lunettes, or, in an even more intimate sense, of a design by Michelangelo done as he was completing the ceiling [Louvre, No. 122 verso]. The Virgin, a slender yet majestically matronly figure, sits in profile to left, and, as in the Windsor Madonna, with the leg drawn in. The Child reaches eagerly up to her from the ground. In the background, modelled, as it were, in the lowest relief befitting the background of a bas-relief, we see two angels in profile again to left. Here, also, the motive is plastic enough for marble or even bronze, but the handling is, as ever in Sebastiano, more or less pictorial, and the touch loose. Thus, as in the Windsor Madonna, the hair of all the figures is indicated in a most summary and unplastic fashion. The draperies over the Virgin's knee fall in characteristic long folds. Her hand is the same root or claw-like affair that serves for a hand in the Windsor Madonna

also. The profiles of the angels recur with slight differences in both the Albertina and Warwick studies for the "Pietà."\*

The last of the designs ascribed to Michelangelo in the attribution of which to Sebastiano I have been anticipated by Professor Wickhoff, is the more than life-size head in black chalk of Leo X. at Chatsworth. It is a painfully veracious study from the model, done by a man before whose vision were floating certain grotesque heads by Michelangelo (such, for example, as the one to the extreme left on a sheet at Lille), but who was himself singularly devoid of spontaneous gift for extracting art out of nature, of instantaneously transfiguring mere appearance into what we call "beauty." Surely not thus would Sebastiano finally have painted Leo, for much though it may have cost him—and we know how slowly he worked—he invariably ended by putting into his portraits if less real style, at any rate more manner, certainly more dash, more stylishness and posing for effect than, for instance, Raphael ever put into his portraits. And while Raphael, although sacrificing nothing surely to flattery, and certainly not actuated by any intention "to beautify," may have poured of veracity a slight libation to the gods who inspire and guide the artist; yet I am persuaded that if Sebastiano had ever finished a portrait of Leo, it would have borne even less likeness to this, his own study, than does Raphael's mighty creation. And lest I should seem to be carrying on the game peculiarly fashionable just now among art-writers of attacking one another without even the common courtesy of addressing the adversary by name, I will add that I have been stung into taking this short leap out of my road into the thorny hedges of æsthetics, by Professor Wickhoff's most singular comments on this head—comments inspired apparently by the very simple doctrine that of art the "whole vocation is endless imitation." I quickly fall into line again, and add that of Sebastiano's right to this Chatsworth head of Leo no doubt can be admitted. Besides presenting that master's characteristic ear, it betrays him in every bit of the handling, and even in the something Venetian in the arrangement of the masses, and in the drawing of the eyes, indeed in something that reminds me of charcoal-heads by Alvise, or Barbari, or Buonsignori.

Yet another batch of drawings remains which I would ascribe to Sebastiano although, to my knowledge, they hitherto have, and still do, pass unquestioned as Michelangelo's. Most of them, like the Venice Madonna, manifest the inspiration of Michelangelo's Ceiling, of the Sibyls, and even more particularly of the family groups and single figures in the spandrels and lunettes. Thus, a red chalk design in the Guise Collection at Christ Church, Oxford, leaves one in the same doubt that does Michelangelo's own splendid drawing in the Louvre [No. 122 verso], whether it be for a Madonna or Holy Family, or rather for one of the Sibyls or domestic groups. The red chalk drawing in question could, of course, not have been for the Ceiling,

\* The hooked forefinger of this Venice Madonna which occurs here in even more exaggerated form than usual with Sebastiano, is exactly matched by forefingers in the various large scrawls in black chalk on the back of that artist's famous "Pietà" at Viterbo.



but so closely does it imitate those groups that one is justified in regarding it as a sort of drawing-lesson in the spirit of these figures. We see a woman in profile to right seated on the ground with a distaff in her arms—the Madonna, we should say. Then a man asleep in almost seated posture with his right arm relaxed on a parapet. Between him, presumably St. Joseph, and the Virgin two children fondle one another—the Infant Christ and the Infant Baptist, we think. But in a cradle in the foreground another child lies asleep, and he disturbs our interpretation. This is not, however, a great concern of ours. Our business is rather to prove that, close an imitation as this drawing is of Michelangelo's last compositions on the Ceiling, it is yet by Sebastiano.

That it is not the great Florentine himself the loose handling, the almost mechanical shading, the faltering touch, the perfunctory draperies, should convince us. Then everything here, from the types to all the curiosities of form, is characteristic of Sebastiano. The old man is almost identical, not only in face but in the action and drawing of the left arm, with the old man in the red chalk Oxford "Pietà." His other arm is as disproportionately long and badly attached as the arm of the Dead Christ in the same "Pietà," and in the other many-figured one in the Albertina; or, if you like, although not in the same position, it is the same arm with the same uncouth hand as the lower assistant's in the looser drawing for the Raising of Lazarus. The woman's right hand is the claw-like thing that serves for a hand to the upper assistant in the same sketch for the Lazarus, with the difference that in this Domestic Subject the hands have the more root-like fingers that we found in the studies of the same collection for the Viterbo Dead Christ. It is not worth while arguing farther. These indications will suffice the competent student, and for himself he can find more and more proofs of this attribution.

A kindred inspiration makes itself felt in yet another red chalk drawing for a Madonna [Louvre No. 112]. A woman of disproportionate length sits with her head slightly bent in profile to left, yet with legs showing almost as if she were facing front. They are crossed at the ankles, and along her skirt between them, the Child nestles in uneasy attitude. Here, also, we see everywhere Sebastiano's loose, flickering touch. The hair, as nearly always, is treated most summarily. The Madonna's hand is but a variation on the hand of the lower attendant in the frequently cited sketch for the Lazarus. The Child is obviously the same that lies asleep in his cradle in the Christ Church Domestic Subject.

Imitation of Michelangelo's Ceiling figures further appears in another sheet in the Louvre [No. 113] drawn on both sides. On the front we see a woman seated in profile to left holding the struggling Child under the shoulders in the hollow of her left hand. She herself seems about to start up violently, almost with the action of the Ezechiel. Another figure vaguely appears in the background. The Virgin's head here should be compared with the head in the last drawing; the awkward meeting of right shoulder and neck, with the same features in the Venice

Madonna; the action of the left leg, its draping, and its foot with the corresponding leg in the Windsor Madonna. On the back is a sort of Holy Family or Rest in the Flight, far more obviously Sebastiano's, among other reasons, because it betrays the influence not only of Michelangelo but of Raphael as well. The Madonna sits with legs crossed at the ankles exactly as in the other Louvre sketch [No. 112], but with her head slightly turned down to left, although her shoulders go to right with the corresponding arm that rests on a cask or saddle. She looks down benignly on the kneeling Infant Baptist, while he looks up prayerfully at the Infant Christ who, sturdily seated in His Mother's lap, blesses him. In the upper right hand corner, behind the cask or saddle, Joseph is seen with hands folded under his beard. As will have appeared from this description, the motive has in it much of Raphael, but every touch is Sebastiano's. The Virgin's head is of the same tall shape that we found in the woman's head of the Christ Church Domestic Subject. Her hair is drawn in the vague, woolly way that we have found in Sebastiano repeatedly. As in the last-mentioned design, her upper arm is relatively thin and shrivelled. Her hand is perfectly identical with the right hand of the Dead Christ in the Windsor "Pieta." Finally, the children are of the same chubby, peak-nosed breed as in the Domestic Subject.

The same inspiration of the Ceiling meets us again in yet another of the Louvre drawings ascribed to Michelangelo [No. d'Ordre 708]. It is a study for a seated female in an attitude recalling the Isaiah, nude but for a drapery thrown over her knees. Sebastiano's mannerisms appear here so clearly that it cannot be necessary at this stage of our discourse to attempt elaborate proof that this drawing also is his. Nothing, for instance, could be more characteristic of him than the despairing search for contours that it reveals.

There remain three further Madonnas ascribed to Michelangelo which I believe to be by Sebastiano. One of them I shall leave to the last as the most interesting. The other two can be dismissed briefly. The more interesting is a smallish black chalk study at Windsor which has been clipped all round the outlines. The Madonna holds the large Child astride on her knee, embracing Him with both her arms, and kissing Him with a solemn tenderness—that exquisite tenderness of many a group in the spandrels and lunettes of the Sixtine Ceiling. Shall I again *ad nauseam* repeat "this is like that" and "that is like this?" If the student has followed me diligently thus far, he can surely demonstrate this problem, now made easy, for himself. Prettier is an almost dainty red chalk sketch in the collection of Mr. J. P. Heseltine. It must be of a more advanced date than the various Louvre Madonnas, having already much of Sebastiano's later elegance such as we begin to discover in the Holy Family with a Donor at the National Gallery. My reasons for ascribing this sketch for a Holy Family to this master are, besides the more general ones of type, and the less stateable ones of spirit, the characteristic handling and shading, the Madonna's hair and all the arms. I invite comparison

with the Malcolm study for the Flagellation and with the various other sketches for Madonnas and Holy Families.

Leaving yet another design for a Madonna, as I have said, to the last, we shall now examine the only two sketches yet unnoticed which I believe to be Sebastiano's despite their utmost universal attribution to Michelangelo. They are a red chalk Adam and Eve belonging to M. Léon Bonnat, and a figure at Windsor, known to be for a "Pieta," although it might seem to be for a Nativity. In M. Bonnat's sheet we see a youthful, robust nude seated with his torso turned very slightly to right, but with his face in profile to left, looking up a little, at the Tree of Life perhaps, with both arms stretched out, no matter how awkwardly, to follow his gaze. His legs are wide apart, and on his left knee sits, but almost standing, a nude female, her right hand touching his shoulder, her left the knee on which she sits, while her right leg is thrown over his right knee. She also has her face in profile to left. Morelli has already judged that this sketch was not of the quality to pass as Michelangelo's, but it did not occur to him that this, or indeed any of the kindred drawings, could be by Sebastiano. Yet it is Sebastiano's, as should at this stage be obvious to all my readers. For appearance sake I shall, however, make the sacro-sanct passes by way of demonstration. With the profile of the Eve we should compare such an one as of the female on the extreme right in the larger Albertina "Pietà." Her back is strikingly identical with the back of the Louvre Madonna [No. 113] and the very peculiar whole right side is the same not only in the last-mentioned sketch but also in the Venice Madonna. Her right foot corresponds to the right foot in the same Louvre drawing. Adam's awkward, fumblingly outlined arms find a match in one of the angels in the Venice Madonna, which angel, by the way, he resembles in type also. Both his and Eve's hair are done with Sebastiano's usual vague symbolism, and the touch in the draperies, particularly in the more rapid shading, does not fail to be characteristically loose and unsteady.

The Windsor sheet contains sketches of one or two figures indicated faintly and of one elaborated one, that one being, I take it, a disciple kneeling on his right knee, his head a little to right, looking down with pity and amazement at something on the ground. His arm drawn back rests along his horizontal thigh. To our right appears a long arm, doubtless of another disciple, just coming in. On our left, vaguely, a woman's head, probably one of the kneeling Mary's. Where all is so characteristic of Sebastiano, what shall we single out? Perhaps the lone arm, so like that of the Madonna in the Louvre [No. 113 verso] or of the woman in the Christ Church Domestic Subject and the hand of the kneeling disciple, with its huge index.\*

\* From a poor copy (in the British Museum, if my memory do not fail me) we become acquainted with the whole of the composition for which this sheet is a partial study. It was a "Pietà" bearing many resemblances to the Warwick one, but by no means comparable to it as a design, and therefore probably earlier. The one elaborated figure in our sketch is almost identical in pose and action with the one on the extreme right in the Warwick "Pietà," and the heads correspond to those crowding in from behind.



And now there remains but the Madonna at the British Museum [Plate cxlix.], which I have reserved to the last. It is indeed a delightful design, preferable even to the one at Venice, and if less majestic than the other at Windsor, perhaps the more gracious. Like these two, and the only other sketch by Sebastiano on a par with them, the Warwick "Pietà," it is in black chalk. The Virgin sits with her legs arranged somewhat as in the Windsor sheet but with the left leg almost folded back, her torso turned on the whole to the left, her head, however, a little to the right, looking down upon the two Holy Infants playing together. Perhaps more than any other of Sebastiano's designs, this is arranged after Michelangelo's own heart to be compact, to get much movement with no change of place, and great dignity combined with tenderness. As a motive, the fall of the Madonna's right arm, and the two children massed under her left arm, is a model of subtle, thoroughly understood composition. Yet it certainly is Sebastiano's. It was doubtless inspired by some such study of Michelangelo's as the one also at the British Museum drawn in anticipation of the Madonna at S. Lorenzo. Compare the heads of the two. Michelangelo's was sketched the more quickly, and yet with how much more decision. Then note how he puts a few significant strokes to indicate the hair, while Sebastiano in highly characteristic fashion fumbles about and about. The Christ Child is the same bright-eyed Venetian putto that we found in the Windsor Madonna, but here he is more playful. In structure he resembles the one in the Venice design, and in action, although with difference of attitude, he is almost identical with it. With the Infant John, both for shape of profile and head, as well as for movement, we should compare the female on the extreme right in the larger Albertina "Pietà." And as this is an important matter, we shall do well to carry the demonstration literally *ad unguem*. So please note the identity between this Madonna's right hand and the hands in the Dead Christ of the Albertina, her foot and the foot of the Madonna at Windsor, as well as the folds over her knees and those on the Virgin's side in the undisputed Louvre study for a Visitation. Of course the fumbling, rather woolly touch is not wanting, and very characteristic is the attempt to correct it by an occasional strong line, as in the under fore-arm of the Christ Child. A striking example of such substitutes for contours is to be found in the now undisputed large Malcolm study for the single figure of Christ at the Column.

---

It thus appears that Sebastiano del Piombo was the author of many of the sketches, and not only of the sketches, but of some of the most attractive and even impressive of the designs still attributed to Michelangelo. And yet I feel as if the great master becomes the greater, lightened of the responsibility for these drawings, and the lesser does not grow much the less because of them. Profoundly interesting as it may be to the naturalist to see how well the leopard may change his skin, the fur-merchant mourns for the spots that are no more. Sebastiano's

notorious dilatoriness, the incredible labour it cost him to bring a picture to completion are due, I doubt not, to the pathetic effort he made to change his nature. Not without this painful effort, an effort which needed on every occasion to be repeated afresh, did the happy-go-lucky, jolly Venetian, who was accustomed to dash on his paint and leave his drawing to the care of Providence, transform himself into a highly intellectualised creator of form in action. If mortal ever did come nigh unto losing himself in a greater artist and yet remaining admirable, it is Sebastiano. But mark I say "admirable." That is far from being all that we expect from the artist, far, I believe, from what Sebastiano functioning properly as a Venetian would have achieved.

We have noted in these designs a number of striking mannerisms. Not one but is an exaggeration of some incipient tendency of Michelangelo's. The claw-like hands, the tapering legs, the excrescent ankles, the occasional goggle-eyes, Sebastiano pounced upon as imitators always have done and always will do, believing that, because so obvious, these exaggerations must therefore somehow be essential to their master's genius. And thus by misunderstanding his manner they create their own mannerisms.

How charmingly Sebastiano drew as a pure Venetian just before falling under Michelangelo's influence, we can see in a couple of dainty yet carefree sketches, one at Lille for the upper part of a faun, which I venture to believe was intended for the Polyphemus, and the other in the collection of Herr von Beckerath for the Juno, both in the Farnesina. Directly thereafter, while Michelangelo was completing the groups in the lunettes and spandrels of the Ceiling, the Venetian put himself under his tuition, drawing, as most of the sketches we have studied witness, either in direct imitation or under the irresistible inspiration of these figures. Indeed these sketches prove conclusively, what other sources leave vague or undecided, that in 1512 Sebastiano was already the bondsman of Michelangelo. No later than that year, to take one instance in point, can we date Michelangelo's drawing of a Sibyl or Madonna with two Children [Louvre, No. 122 verso]. At no other time was Sebastiano so likely to have imitated such a work as while it was still fresh, and this drawing or another in the same style, must have been at the back of such designs of Sebastiano's as the Madonna at Venice. We have seen how little at first the Venetian understood what Michelangelo meant to make out of such a motive as the "Pietà," and we have seen him finally, I should say toward 1520 or soon afterwards, producing such a wonderfully comprehended design as the Warwick "Pietà." But each and every time apparently he had to begin at the beginning, and transform himself from the thoughtless rather than poor Venetian draughtsman into a would-be great Florentine one. And so with studies for the Madonna. How intimately in the one at the British Museum has he penetrated into the secret of Michelangelo's feeling for compact arrangement and for action without change of place! Did this influence ever wane? In 1532 we still find him asking the master to help him out in composing the Birth of the Virgin for

the Chigi Chapel at S. Maria del Popolo,\* and Sebastiano's design for that work betrays a woeful need of the master's simplifying and co-ordinating mind. Apparently Michelangelo did not respond, for the finished picture is scarcely less confused than the sketch. As for the sketch, it is only in the drawing of the extremities that it betrays the influence of Buonarroti. More interesting is a study for a Madonna once in the Gatteaux Collection and now, I believe, in the Louvre, which I should date somewhat earlier than 1532, where I find Sebastiano less Michelangelesque than usual. But that may be accidental, and as it is among the latest authentic drawings by him known to me, I must leave this question undecided.

## II

Having cleared out of our way some of the deservedly most famous designs ascribed to Michelangelo, we now can deal with the remainder more rapidly, trying to assign them to their real authors, and proceeding in order more or less chronological.

The earliest of Michelangelo's pupils to whom the master's work has been attributed is a certain Andrea, of whom I know nothing further than what I have been able to extract from the sketches I assume to be by him. Michelangelo's splendid Oxford design of a dragon [No. 13], is drawn over a profile by another much feebler hand, obviously a pupil's. The same hand appears in the various sketches on the other side of the leaf, which sketches are neither more nor less than a drawing-lesson ending up with the master's words, "Andrea abbi patientia Ame me Consolatione assai!" These words give us the pupil's name, of whom, as I have said, I have been able to find no further trace. As the dragon drawn by Michelangelo himself over the profile by Andrea can scarcely be dated later than 1508, we may suppose that Andrea was under Michelangelo before the latter began the Ceiling. If I do not mistake, Andrea is also the author of several other leaves ascribed to his master. The most important, which might almost pass for Sebastiano's, is one at the British Museum containing the figure of a young woman seated in profile with distaff in hand. The inspiration of this not unattractive but feeble spinner was certainly some such creation of the master's as the two early Sibyl-like young women on both sides of a leaf, in this same collection. Nay, it probably is copied from some lost original of this kind. Another leaf is in the Malcolm Collection [No. 56], and contains on one side in red chalk a satyr's head, the bust of a young man and several more sketchy profiles, and on the other side the head in profile of one of those imperial, fancifully dressed women which in their time have passed for portraits of Vittoria Colonna and, as such, have enjoyed great renown. Now this profile is certainly much smoother and more finished than the heads on the other side, yet the touch

\* Milanese, "Les Correspondants de Michel-Ange," p. 88.



is the same more or less palsied one, transubstantiating, for instance, the curling, electric human hair drawn by the master into damp cotton thread ; so that I see no overpowering reasons for refusing to assume that the profile is by the same hand that did the other sketches, that is to say, by Andrea. Of course he did not create this type ; he simply copied it, as a painstaking pupil, after a sketch by the master.

And lest the student should find the difference between the front and back of this last leaf too great to persuade him that both sides were done by the same hand, let me urge him to examine carefully the sketches on the back of Uffizi No. 599, the front of which is certainly by the hand that did this Vittoria Colonna. There we find two female profiles done in the same loose tentative way that we meet with in the sketches on the back of the Malcolm sheet, and also at Oxford in Andrea's drawing-lesson, while another profile of a young woman is more elaborated and more than half-way toward such highly finished work as the head we have just been studying. The Uffizi leaf, therefore, furnishes a firm stepping-stone between the very rough and the highly finished work, while at the same time it and the crude tentative sketches on the verso of another sheet containing a head of the same highly finished kind [Uffizi, No. 598] afford proof that we are not dealing with a casual leaf, drawn on accidentally by two different hands, but with a series of studies by a tyro, who likes to display on the same leaf his own feeble powers of more or less original sketching, and his ability to make painstaking and docile copies after the models set him by his master.

A design of similar character and conception and of identical quality as draughtsmanship is the ideal head in profile of a warrior in armour, also in the Malcolm Collection [No. 55]. It is extraordinarily over-loaded with ornament, yet essentially Michelangesque in conception, and not merely vaguely so, but resembling the profile by Andrea already mentioned, and still others of which I shall speak presently, in the character of various heads drawn by Michelangelo himself just before he began the Ceiling. Both these heads, however, are certainly by the same hand which made a number of other profiles, one of which Morelli ascribed to Bacchiacca. Apparently Morelli's one and only reason for thus ascribing them was that three heads on an Uffizi sheet [No. 599] were used by Bacchiacca in his picture representing Moses Striking the Rock.\* Morelli assumed as a matter of course that these heads were studies for the corresponding heads in the picture, but careful inspection reveals that they were drawn without this, if with any, ulterior purpose. The most attractive of the profiles, so singularly like the one on Malcolm No. 56, could never have been thus conceived by an artist who meant it to belong to a woman drinking, nor that upper one for a woman carrying a heavy child on her shoulder. The much more probable explanation is that somehow Bacchiacca got hold of this sheet and introduced these profiles as best he could into his picture, very much in the way that, according to Morelli himself,

\* In the Giovanelli Collection at Venice. See "Die Galerien Borghese und Doria," p. 136.

he used Perugino's design of Apollo and Marsyas for a picture of Adam and Eve, or, to use an even better parallel, as he introduced into most of his paltry inventions figures taken over from Lucas van Leyden.

I shall return to this point in a moment, but meanwhile let us look at yet another of these fanciful profiles, logically ascribed by Morelli to Bacchiacca. Like the last sheet, it also is in the Uffizi [No. 598]. It represents a young woman in profile wearing a curling helmet on the back of her head, and a dress which leaves her breast bare. It is a fascinating creation which Dr. Wölfflin does well to put alongside of Piero di Cosimo's Cleopatra, but more intimately it has the character of such designs from Michelangelo's own hand as the two Sibyl-like young women of early date on both sides of the same sheet at the British Museum. Doubtless there was a sketch by the master of nearly the same date, 1507 or 1508, which our Andrea has here copied and elaborated.\*

On the same sheet as this Michelangelesque Cleopatra, and close beside her, we find a rougher sketch of an old man's head. This is of so similar a character to that of another man's head on another leaflet in the Uffizi [No. 603, Plate cl.] that we must not hesitate to ascribe both to the same hand, although Morelli failed to do so. Here also, we find in more finished state the bust of a youngish woman who, but for her being full face, is of the exact character and quality of the profiles we have just studied. The same eyes, the same more or less fantastic coiffure, the same lifeless ringlets. At Frankfort there is a sheet already ascribed to Bacchiacca (in logical sequence of Morelli's theory) with one head like the last, another of a puffy-faced boy, an ear, and a leg—the leg being a faithful copy of an early pen-drawing by Michelangelo [Louvre, No. d'Ordre 1972 verso].

Let us now return to the hypothesis that these various heads are, as Morelli supposed, Bacchiacca's. I must in the first place insist on two points. Whoever did these heads had learned under Michelangelo, and under no one else. For this assumption I find ample guarantee in the stroke, in the handling, in everything in short which can distinguish one type of drawing from another. But for the quality, these heads differ in no respect from drawings by Michelangelo himself—a case which could not have occurred had these inventions of the master been copied by some one who, like Bacchiacca, had notoriously been taught elsewhere. Moreover, as we shall see in the next chapter, we do possess unquestionable drawings by Bacchiacca, and they never betray in any essential element a trace of Michelangelo's personal teaching, or even influence. Then, I assume it to be something like an axiom that when a pupil or admirer does imitate a living master with whom he is in personal contact, he will imitate him in the phase wherein he finds him. Now all these drawings, without exception, would, if they were Michelangelo's own, have to be dated 1507-1509 and scarcely later. But in those years, according to Morelli, Bacchiacca was undergoing or had but just undergone his boyish

\* A slighter version of the same profile is in the Louvre [No. d'Ordre 1075], where it is ascribed to Piero di Cosimo.

apprenticeship under Perugino. Morelli then lets him pass under Franciabigio, under Andrea del Sarto and finally under Michelangelo, when some time between 1530 and 1536, he would have had him paint the Giovanelli Moses striking the Rock—the picture for which Morelli supposed him to have drawn the three heads in the Uffizi. To me it seems little less than absurd to assume that Bacchiacca would not have imitated Michelangelo in the phase wherein he found him at this, the correct date for the Giovanelli picture. It is most unlikely that he would have gone back *en archéologue* to a period of the master's twenty or more years earlier. Would Morelli have answered "But these heads are copies only of originals by Michelangelo which Bacchiacca was lucky enough to pick up," I should have replied that he, Bacchiacca, would have copied these originals in the technique and manner of a pupil of Perugino, Franciabigio and Andrea, and not, as these heads are copied, in the technique of Michelangelo and Michelangelo only.

I have purposely left to this point the mention of another bust of a young female at Windsor. It is so clearly by the hand that I assume to be Andrea's that it would be insulting the student to attempt to demonstrate it. But this head occurs, if you please, on the back of the famous Fall of Phaeton done for Tommaso Cavalieri. Now it was Michelangelo's habit to keep for years and decades all sorts of scraps of paper, and to draw, when the spirit moved him, upon the first piece that came to his hand, not hesitating to take the vacant space on a side already partly used whether by himself or a pupil, and still less to use a clean verso. So it is not surprising that some twenty and more years after Andrea had sketched this head, which certainly remained with Michelangelo, the latter should by accident have used the clean side for his own design; but if this and consequently all these other heads were by Bacchiacca, there would be no accounting for it being in Michelangelo's hands—unless indeed we fall back on the absurd notion that Bacchiacca assisting Michelangelo in 1531, yet imitated a much earlier phase of that master's style.

Thus Morelli's attribution of these heads to Bacchiacca seems untenable, and on closer inspection turns out even absurd. The witness of our eyes is to the far more probable hypothesis that they all are by Andrea. As we have already seen, three at least of these sheets have besides the smoothly finished heads on the one side, cruder, looser sketches on the other, quite identical with those in Andrea's drawing-lesson at Oxford. Two of these rougher sketches [Uffizi, No. 598], moreover, have precisely the same ear and the same aimless treatment of hair as the British Museum design for a spinner, and thus further establish that this last-named drawing also is beyond reasonable doubt by the same hand. In short, and to sum up, let me repeat that this Andrea—to distinguish him from all other Andreas I would suggest calling him, until, if ever, we discover his real name, Andrea di Michelangelo—must have come under Michelangelo just before the latter was beginning the Ceiling. He then and soon afterwards made the limited number of drawings just described. Years later, one of these fell into the hands of Bacchiacca,



who thereupon, scissors-and-paste artist that he was, stuck them into that prettily displayed collection of the fruits of his pilfering and begging, the Giovannelli picture.\*

## III

Another pupil of Michelangelo's was a certain Silvio Falconi, of Magliano, near Rome. The very little that I have been able to discover about him will be found in the catalogue in connection with the eight leaflets out of a sketch-book ascribed to Michelangelo, but which seem to be by this Silvio. The sketches in question are at Oxford [Nos. 24 and 25]. That they ever could have been attributed to the great master, witnesses to a sad state of ignorance regarding his manner and style as a draughtsman. It is not surprising perhaps that theories of Michelangelo's method as an artist should have been based upon them; but that scrawls like these should have been admired by people like Ottley and Sir Charles Robinson tells a singular tale of eyes hypnotised by a name. No less amazing to us who know Michelangelo's piecemeal method of work, to us who know that almost certainly the lunettes were not even contemplated when the Ceiling was begun, is Robinson's calm statement that these notes "for" figures in the lunettes were jotted down in 1508. On the contrary, we discover a certain significance in the fact that most of these sketches connect themselves with the lunettes and other later parts of the Ceiling. They point to the probability that Silvio then entered Michelangelo's service, and took his drawing-lessons on the figures which he found his master painting, perhaps even on the original sketches for them.

Of the quality of these drawings by Silvio there is little to be said. As might be expected from the pupil of so great a master, his own mannerisms are mere imitations of every trick of the teacher's. Quality apart, nothing could well be more Michelangelesque than these jottings. They promise more, however, than do any of Andrea's or—to anticipate—any of Antonio Mini's sketches.

## IV

In the Casa Buonarroti there is a large design for a Madonna suckling the Child [Plate cli.]. It is, of course, ascribed to Michelangelo, and this attribution has never been disputed, nor indeed has this drawing ever received much attention. The Madonna is seen to just below the knees, seated somewhat to left but looking

\* Another sketch by the same hand is the Cleopatra in the Casa Buonarroti [No. 2]. It is a pretty picture of a rather sentimental, elegant, yet coarse young female, looking to right, while the adder twines about her naked breast. She also was doubtless copied by Andrea after some indication by the master. As drawing this has all the characteristic of Andrea's other studies, although it is more highly finished than most. A comparison with those in the Malcolm Collection, and those in the Uffizi [Nos. 598, 599, and 603], will suffice to explain my meaning. Finally, a female profile in Christ Church Library, at Oxford, deserves mention. It should be observed that, of the more attractive of these heads, several versions exist. In each case I have spoken of that one which seems to be the original.

a little to right, with the Child at her right breast. He is heavy and she holds Him awkwardly. She herself is thick-lipped, a trifle stolid, and even wooden, at all events all of one piece and unarticulated. Nevertheless, she is Michelangelesque enough in type and intended action. Indeed her torso and left arm differ but slightly from what we find in such another Michelangelesque sketch as Sebastiano's Madonna in the Louvre [No. 121]. Like the latter, the Madonna before us reveals the inspiration of the figures in the lunettes of the Sixtine Ceiling, and must have been done soon after these were finished.

But by whom? Certainly not by Michelangelo himself. It is not only that this design is in quality altogether unworthy of him, but the materials—black and red chalk with much white—are to my knowledge never again found in any existing work by that master, and the Child, besides being modelled in a way that is not Michelangelo's, is not even of his type.

The Virgin's right hand resting on the Child's shoulder, is peculiar in that the index finger is drawn away as far as it will go from the others. This singular mannerism is found in this exact degree in only two Florentine painters, Franciabigio and Bugiardini, painters who in other respects so resemble one another that frequently it is difficult to tell them apart. But Franciabigio, although no more free than any other younger Florentine artist from Michelangelo's influence, never apparently formed part of that giant's circle, and in his existing pictures there are no signs of conspicuous borrowing from the greater master. Quite different were Bugiardini's relations to him. Michelangelo and he were on intimate terms to the end, and there were times when the mighty genius shunned the world and saw scarcely any one but his "simpleton"\* friend. Moreover, it is as good as certain that the same friend was one of Michelangelo's assistants on the Ceiling. Of the two painters, therefore, to whom the peculiar hand and, I might have added, just this build of Child as well, point as author of this Casa Buonarroti cartoon, Bugiardini must, on outside considerations, be selected. Internal evidence confirms this choice. In Franciabigio's "Madonna del Pozzo," for instance (Florence, Tribuna) the Virgin's hand rests on the Child's shoulder almost as it does here, but the fingers are not as here almost painfully stretched apart. In Bugiardini's fine picture of the young Baptist about to drink (Bologna Gallery) the hand which holds the bowl has the index finger drawn away from the others, exactly as in our design. Then I find the elaborate modelling of the Child, heavy, hard, and free from all subtleties of gradation, as for example in the Bologna altar-piece, a frequent although not a constant characteristic of Bugiardini. Add something in the Madonna's look which I find in the St. John at Bologna already mentioned, in the so-called "Monaca" at the Pitti [No. 140], which I am not alone in attributing

\* In 1549 Michelangelo writes to Leonardo: "Bugiardini is a good body but a simpleton." Milanese, "Lettere," p. 247. In September 1531, Giovantonio Mini writes to Valori that, besides Bugiardini, Michelangelo sees only his assistant, Antonio Mini. Gaye, "Carteggio," p. 229. Bugiardini is mentioned in Granacci's letter to Michelangelo, wherein possible assistants for the Ceiling are discussed. Frey, "Briefe an Michelagnolo," p. 10.

to Bugiardini, and in other pictures by the same painter, and the probability that he and no one else was the author of this design becomes almost a certainty.

With two exceptions—let me add, now that we are discussing this painter—I have been able to discover no further drawings by Bugiardini. The exceptions are a young woman's head in black chalk belonging to Mr. Charles Loeser of Florence, and a sketch for the Baptist, in the Uffizi. The pose of Mr. Loeser's head is identical with that in the last design, but the features are even heavier and more stolid, more as in the St. Catherine of the Bologna altar-piece.\* The handling is nearly the same in both designs, and there can be little doubt that they are by the same author. The Baptist is obviously Bugiardini's, a study for yet another canvas of that painter's favourite subject.

It is a temptation to seize this opportunity of making a plea for my attribution of the Madonna and Angels of the National Gallery [No. 809] to the same Giuliano Bugiardini. I do not doubt but I could make out my case and prove that while he must have had some sketch of Michelangelo's to work upon, he and he only is responsible for the completed cartoon and the execution, and that he must have painted this picture just before the beginning or during the progress of the Sistine Ceiling. But, like hundreds of other points that the present book tempts me to linger over, this one also must be brushed aside. We must not depart from the drawings except when it is necessary for their better understanding, or when other problems depend entirely upon them.

## V

Great and small, we all know the person who turns round and hates us from the day that he determines no longer to be our follower but to pose as a master on his own account, though he realises with despair that he can never attain our own level. His despair does not last long. Soon it disappears before a virulent activity of intrigue calculated not so much to lift these unhappy victims of maniac envy high, as to bring the objects of their envy low. The classic instance of such a relation was that between Michelangelo and Baccio Bandinelli. Its pleasant honey-moon seems to have been toward 1517† when Michelangelo seeing Baccio's eagerness to learn, apparently expected great things of him. And Bandinelli did learn much. His numerous drawings are not without interest, and there are tasks far less pleasant than their perusal. All of them, however, are dry and done by rote. Never do they betray a real feeling for form. They present stereotyped torsos and limbs, executed with great swagger and much manner. The mannerisms are unmistakable. There is the dry outline which never becomes a contour, the hatching, hemmed in, as it were, by an invisible boundary, the cross lines that

\* Reverse this head and it differs only in expression from the Madonna in the same picture.

† Frey, "Briefe an Michelagnolo," p. 73.



produce the effect of a rough, fuzzy edge of cloth, and the aimless, wriggling curves. And of course there lacks no evidence that Bandinelli did not so much as suspect what Michelangelo's purpose really was.

To take an example. Among the surprisingly few drawings by Bandinelli which still pass for Michelangelo's, there is in the Louvre a large pen-sketch [No. d'Ordre 322] done with a desire perhaps to improve upon Michelangelo's Matthew. But what has Bandinelli achieved? He has so draped the figure that the chest is left bare, while the arms are invisible. The result is that the marvellous action of the original, depending almost entirely upon the bareness of the arms and shoulders, is completely lost.

More modest efforts on his part are copies after lost original sketches by Michelangelo for his Slaves. They are all in the Louvre. One of them [No. 114], of a beautiful youth in profile to right, is as good as signed by Bandinelli, for he has hung from the right arm a shadowy drapery (which I need hardly say could not have existed in the original) done in a way that is matched exactly in his large drawing at the Ambrosiana in Milan [photo. Braun, No. 6] after the Apollo Belvedere.

Again, he was all his life, and long after he had set up braying claims to be a rival and even superior, happy to make copies after Michelangelo's finished works. There scarcely exists aught more characteristic of his rapid pen and wash manner than his large sketch at the British Museum (where it still passes for Michelangelo's) after one of the decorative nudes in the Ceiling [photo. Braun, No. 10]. At Lille there is a scarcely less characteristic copy [No. 97], after one of the demons in the Last Judgment.

Bandinelli's most successful imitation of Michelangelo is the famous Satyr's profile [Plate clii.], in which Mariette thought he had discovered the drawing of Vasari's tale: how Michelangelo, as a boy, seeing a fellow pupil sweating in vain to draw a woman's head, turned it in derision into that of a satyr. True, here also, a satyr's head has been drawn over that of a woman. But the latter, scrawled in chalk, either was done by Andrea di Michelangelo, or in imitation of him (see catalogue), and not earlier, therefore, than 1507. As for the Satyr's head, I could believe it sketched with the intention of being passed off as Michelangelo's, but I am convinced that it is Bandinelli's. I recognise him in the sweeping stroke, in the hard line of the eye, in the dry outline of the nose, and in the cross-hatching on the same, as well as in the shading of the background. Before he rejects this attribution, I would beg the earnest student to devote some forty or fifty hours—not half that I have spent—to the examination of Bandinelli's unquestioned drawings in the Louvre, in the Ambrosiana, and above all, in the Uffizi.

## VI

Antonio Mini entered Michelangelo's service at the end of 1523 as a lad of eighteen, and remained for eight years, leaving him finally it would seem because an unhappy love affair made it prudent to depart from Florence. His master thereupon gave him his Leda with which he was to make his fortune in what at that time to the Florentine apprentice was both Golconda and Eldorado, namely Paris. From Lyons he wrote letters savouring of Marco Polo; but apparently he was a simpleton, and some unscrupulous countryman of his—able precursors of those *Padroni* who nowadays will not succumb to the combined efforts of the American and Italian governments—swindled him of his treasure. Whereupon he died of a broken heart.

The phrasing, and still more the spelling, of his letters is almost fantastically bad, and would go to prove that he was the kind of person upon whom education was wasted. For surely eight years of intimate contact with Michelangelo should have taught him Tuscan at least. A striking resemblance between Mini's handwriting and that of Michelangelo's foreman at this period, Stefano di Tommaso, inclines me to believe that writing was taught Antonio by the latter. But Michelangelo himself undertook to teach him drawing, and one of these drawing-lessons has, by a pleasant accident, been preserved. It consists of two sketches in the master's best and freest style, on a sheet at the British Museum, dated October 4, 1524, and Mini's copies of these sketches beside the originals. Nothing could easily surpass their crudeness, not even the crudest essays that one's eyes light upon in Anthropological Museums. Under one of these copies Michelangelo wrote in the same spirit that led him, as we remember, to comment upon a sketch of Andrea's, "Draw, Antonio, draw, and don't waste time." If Antonio could do no better than this, after nearly a year's instruction, it is to be feared that time could do little for him. Nor indeed is it certain that he ever attained to even respectable mediocrity. The only other two drawings of interest which are his beyond all doubt must have been done toward the end of his service with Michelangelo, for one of them is of a figure not unlike the master's Tityus. This is in the Louvre [No. 116], and on its back are a number of other sketches of trifling importance, all ascribed to Michelangelo. Along with these sketches are a score or so of lines of attempted verse, scribbled no doubt under the influence of the master's habit and perhaps under the spur of the passion which drove poor Antonio from Florence. It is thanks to these verses, let me add, that I have been able to identify this sheet as his. Not only is the handwriting clearly his, but the absurd spelling as well. Note, for instance, his reduplication of the "t." But, to return to the sketches, they prove that little was to be made of Mini.

At Oxford there is a drawing of a reclining figure, a Samson perhaps, awaking, and near it, on the same leaf, an archer. The reclining figure is

incorrect, stunted, thickset, fuzzy, a very poor anticipation of Daniele da Volterra's manner. In an ancient hand it is inscribed as Antonio Mini's, and a comparison with the Tityus-like figure at the Louvre fully confirms this old attribution. Whether the more elaborated design for a Samson, also at Oxford [No. 55], is not by Mini rather than by Montelupo, I cannot quite determine, although much in its modelling and other peculiarities inclines me to regard it as the former's. His, again, may be yet one other sketch at Oxford [No. 79], a study of a reeling Faun. This is somewhat better than I should expect of him; but if he could make, as we know he did, a copy of his master's Leda worth a price, he may, after all, have attained a certain respectable level of craftsmanship.

## VII

Excepting Sebastiano del Piombo, no other artist was the author of so many drawings still ascribed to Michelangelo—I mean seriously ascribed—as Raffaelle da Montelupo. Most of them to my knowledge still pass unquestioned, and of those which may have been doubted none, so far as I am aware, has been attributed to Montelupo. Yet I venture to believe that he is to be held responsible for them, and I will here try to give, as briefly as possible, my reasons.

First let us see which these designs are—or at least the principal among them. The following list will show:

*Florence.* UFFIZI [No. 619]. Children playing at hot cockles, and two nudes, one reclining and the other seated nearly doubled up [Plate cliii.].

[No. 794<sup>o</sup>]. Three Eagles.

Verso: Another Eagle and the right arm and shoulder of a youth.

*Munich.* A draped seated figure, and a nude walking away in profile to right.

*Paris.* THE LOUVRE [No. 111]. A nude in an attitude recalling the resurrected Christ on the back of the Tityus at Windsor.

Verso: Rough sketch for one of the façades of the Medici Chapel at S. Lorenzo.

[No. 124]. Copy after Michelangelo's Madonna in the Medici Chapel.

Verso: Another Version of the same Madonna, a satyr in acrobatic attitude, masks, hands, and a dog's head.

*Oxford.* THE UNIVERSITY GALLERIES [No. 20]. A charger standing against a panoply, a nude trying to rein in two plunging steeds, and the profile of a youth.

Verso: A nude youth, a smaller draped female figure, and sketches of capitals.



[No. 43]. Copy of Michelangelo's *Twilight*, two other nudes seated, torsos and a head.

Verso : A skeleton and various studies of legs.

[No. 44]. Three studies of a leg.

Verso : Two legs and a group of dead or dying nudes.

[No. 45]. A large number of various sketches some of them for children's toys, over which on the left are scribbled down in Michelangelo's own hand a number of verses.

Verso : Among other sketches two studies for a *Hercules* and *Antæus* and two caricatured profiles.

[No. 49]. An architectural drawing.

Verso : A nude with his right arm held up.

[No. 51]. Bust of an old man, two grotesque profiles, anatomy of a leg, etc.

[No. 52]. Free rendering of Michelangelo's *Children's Bacchanal* now at Windsor.

Verso : Three studies for lower part of a nude and of an entire nude figure, with legs in the same position.

[No. 54]. Various studies for chimney pieces, and upper part of nearly nude female.

[No. 57]. *Jupiter embracing Ganymede*.

Verso : A nude seen from the back, grotesques and other sketches. The authenticity of this leaf has been declared dubious by Sir Chas. Robinson.

[No. 66]. Study of a torso suggested probably by the famous *Vatican Torso*.\*

That these drawings are by the same hand admits of small discussion. In some the same types recur, in others the same expression, but what chiefly makes them recognisable as of identical authorship is the handling, the pen-stroke, the shading, and all the various short-cuts that eventually every draughtsman falls into to aid him in his effects—which short-cuts are perhaps as peculiar to each separate artist as any other characteristic whatsoever.

It matters but little with which sheet we begin our examination. Let it be Oxford No. 20. The front, as we remember, contains studies after a bronze horse standing against a panoply, a charioteer trying to drive plunging steeds, and the large profile of a youth. Perhaps nothing strikes one so much at first sight in these sketches as the singular appearance presented by the massing of light and shade. The transitions do not suggest nature, but the dripping aspect of the quasi-stalactitic decorations of Cinquecento grottoes. Looking further, we observe what is not a little singular, that the lines of the shading go from left to right, as

\* Further information about these drawings will be found in the catalogue under the rubric "School of Michelangelo."

if they had been done by a left-handed person. The charioteer is a mere scrawl, and therefore sure to reveal the habitual unreflective ways of the draughtsman. We note a tendency to flatten circles, as in the breast and the eye, and that the eye hangs touching the line of the brow, as a shell from a string. It should not escape us, moreover, that the author, in the midst of his penmanship, introduces just a few touches of the crayon. The form of the ear also is worth remembering. On the back is a large crayon contour of a nude. His limbs taper off to the wrists and ankles, so as to suggest Indian clubs. His left foot is in peculiar perspective and touches the ground with the toes only, and these are flat.

Oxford No. 49 verso is another figure in crayon, nude but for a tight-fitting sort of tunic. His right foot is lifted and he stands on the left only. This foot nevertheless is drawn in identical fashion and even worse perspective than the left foot of the first nude, the toes this time not flat but almost vertical. As this is an impossible position for a standing figure, we may safely assume that it was not intentional, but is in both instances to be regarded as a trick of bad drawing. Nor does this mannerism fail to reappear in varied shapes. Thus, in Oxford No. 52 verso, which contains various pen-sketches for a nude with right arm given in two positions and pointing left hand, and of various legs for the same figure, the right foot of the nude if more elaborated would be nearly identical with those in the first two nudes. It is however indicated almost as a mere anatomical stump, and this manner of leaving it we find exaggerated in the other right feet on the same sheet. To make sure that we are not founding too much on one sole trick, let us not fail to observe that the limbs curve and taper like Indian clubs, as we have already seen in the other sketches, and that whatever shading appears goes from left to right. It is further to be noted that the ankle-bones tend to be huge and to bulge out to our left.

On the other side of the sheet that we now are examining we find what has hitherto passed as the sketch for the Windsor design representing a Bacchanal of Children. Surely it is but a simplified copy, done perhaps from memory, just after seeing the original. I cannot take time to expatiate upon the striking differences in æsthetic merit between the two. Merely quantitative and not qualitative analysis should suffice to establish that its author is he who did the other drawings now under consideration. The shading, for example, all goes from left to right, and where it is more elaborated tends to the dripping grotto-stucco effect already described. The limbs curve in and out and are round; the eyes are flattened circles and some cling to the line of the brow, etc. etc.

Not the most sceptical student, if well intentioned, will allow himself to doubt that whoever made this version of the Bacchanal also drew the sheet at the Uffizi [Plate cliii.] containing two nudes, a number of limbs, six or seven children playing at hot cockles—this last, by the way, almost surely after some design, now lost, by Michelangelo. These children are, to take but one obvious comparison, closer to those in the Bacchanal than brothers. Then, as for resemblances with the

drawings as a whole, all the shading is as in these from left to right; the right arm of the crouching nude tapers off to the wrist in familiar fashion; the right arm and the claw-like hand of the reclining figure are like enough to the lower right arm of the nude in Oxford No. 52 verso to have been cast in the same mould. And with no less certainty may Louvre No. 124 be ascribed to the same draughtsman. On the front there is a design passing as a study by Michelangelo for his Madonna at S. Lorenzo. But here also the dripping effect, the shading from left to right, betray the author of the other sketches, as does indeed every quirk and turn of the pen. The only visible hand should be compared with the left hands of the larger nudes in the Uffizi sheet just mentioned. On the back we meet with a sketch after the same Madonna, taken from another position, two masks, a dog's head, three hands, and a satyr-like nude with his torso violently thrown back and his right arm flung forward. Here again the shading goes from left to right, and the satyr stands on feet ending, as in Oxford No. 52 verso, in hastily sketched stumps. Observe that in one of the hands the bone seems to protrude through the skin, which perhaps would indicate in the artist a great pre-occupation with anatomy.

Oxford No. 43 contains on one side two seated figures, a copy after Michelangelo's *Twilight* (not of course the original study), a head and two torsos seen from the back, and on the other side a skeleton and various studies of a leg in running position. I should have added that on the front there is in black chalk the profile of a head, perhaps copied after the antique. Here also the shading is highly significant, being both dripping in effect and drawn from left to right. The right arm and hand of the *Twilight* are the same as in the reclining figure of Uffizi No. 619; the only other hand resembles the very bony one in Louvre No. 124 verso. Noteworthy is the fact that, as in most of the other sheets of this series, the draughtsman seemed suddenly to have tired of using the pen, and to have taken for an instant to the crayon.

Our author's keen interest in anatomy is revealed in Oxford No. 44, which contains on both sides a number of studies after a flayed right leg. Although the shading in these studies invariably goes from left to right I should have hesitated to make sure that they were by the draughtsman that did the remainder of this series if, besides these studies, the sheet did not also offer a group of reclining nudes, unmistakably his. The limbs suffice to prove it. And if these legs are his, his also must be four others, in the Uffizi [No. 622], identical with these, although done with the pen.

With Oxford No. 54 and Uffizi No. 794<sup>o</sup> finishes the list of the more important drawings of this series obviously by the same draughtsman. The first contains studies for a chimney-piece; and under the completest one the half-length figure of a female, nude from the waist up, with a veil falling from her head. Again the shading goes from left to right. The woman's ear resembles that of the profile in Oxford No. 20, etc. etc. The Uffizi sheet has proud eagles on both sides, and on one a right arm and shoulder as well. The shading here is unmistakable.



Before continuing the examination of the drawings which belong, as I believe, to this series, let us pause and inquire who made them. It may seem pedantic in me to have avoided mentioning in connection with each separate one Raffaele da Montelupo's name, when at the very start I gave him out to be their real author. But it should be a principle with students of the history of art to begin with the strenuous attempt to establish artistic personality on a basis of such artistic products as surely reveal a common authorship; then and then only, to connect this artistic personality with an actual historical one; and, finally, to return with the gain thus acquired to re-study the artistic personality—the reconstruction of which artistic personality should be the one and only purpose, aim, and intention of intelligent art-history. Having, as I trust, established that the drawings already discussed in this section must all have been made by the same hand, I shall now try to prove that that hand was Montelupo's, whereupon we shall turn to the other sketches that I fain would ascribe to him instead of to Michelangelo, although they do not quite so obviously as those already examined appear to be by the same draughtsman.

Among the exposed drawings of the Uffizi are seven or eight attributed to Montelupo, six of which are inscribed in an old hand "Raffaele da Montelupo." Ancient attributions to minor masters are seldom erroneous, and least of all where, as in this instance, a whole group of drawings has been attributed in a way that our modern self-conscious analysis can demonstrate to be correct. We therefore are safe in assuming that at least the six inscribed drawings are Montelupo's.

[No. 1225]. Man in toga, and a youth in tunic nearly facing him, with a sort of stand between them, upon which on a book perches a fowl looking at the man. Under the stand lies a goat. To the left a hare and above it a number of concentric circles. Pen and ink. The subject suggests the well-known Horoscope after Giorgione at Dresden.

[No. 1226]. A prophet sitting turned to left, but facing to right, draped in a mantle which, but for the right arm, covers him entirely. Also the profile of a youth. Pen and ink.

[No. 1227]. Two nude old satyrs in conversation. Pen and ink.

[No. 1228]. Old satyr walking, holding with his right hand an urn upon his head, and with the other leading a baby faun. Pen and ink.

[No. 1229]. The Madonna embracing the Child. Black chalk.

[No. 1231]. Youngish woman in profile to right and a child climbing up her shoulder. Behind her an old woman of the type of Rosso's Three Fates (Pitti) heavily draped, also in profile to right, and above and behind her, a faun with left arm stretched out and claw-like hand touching the young woman's head while the other is violently drawn back. Black chalk.

In all these sketches, with the exception of No. 1229, the shading goes from left to right, as we found it in the other drawings that we have been studying in this section. The effect of the masses tends to be dripping, and suggests grotto-stuccos. Some of the eyes, as, for instance, of the youth in No. 1225, take the shape of flattened circles and are attached to the line of the brow as to a string. The head of the old man in the same sketch is of the same type as that of the *Twilight* and of the head beside it in Oxford No. 43. In No. 1226 the profile of a youth has a strong family likeness to that of the youth in Oxford No. 20. The claw-like hand of the faun in No. 1231 is identical with that in Uffizi No. 619, and with the lower hand of the nude in Oxford No. 52 verso. The young woman in the same drawing is own sister to the one in Oxford No. 54. The ankle-bones in all these Uffizi studies tend to bulge out to the left, and the perspective of the feet is awkward. In brief, no reasonable doubt can be entertained that these sketches are by the hand that did the others that we are now studying.\*

I have said that the attribution of these Uffizi drawings to Montelupo is not to be questioned lightly. There are happily considerations other than those of style to confirm this, and also my own ascription of those other sketches which are still attributed to Michelangelo.

These various sketches, then, with one or at the utmost two exceptions, are shaded from left to right, a proceeding singular indeed, and so rare that I should be at a loss to name off-hand, besides the famous case of Leonardo, other instances of it. As in Leonardo, it was doubtless due to the left-handedness of the draughtsman. Now, although we have it on Montelupo's statement that Michelangelo was naturally left-handed, he, Michelangelo, never used his left hand except when it could help out the right. In the same passage of his charming autobiography, Montelupo informs us that he himself was not only left-handed, but drew with his left hand. And he relates how Michelangelo and Sebastiano, seeing him drawing thus, "stopped a long time to look at me, marvelling much, as at a case which, so far as one knows, had never occurred before among either painters or sculptors."† If this anecdote is trustworthy, and there surely exists no reason for disputing it, it follows that Michelangelo among his dependents knew no other person who drew with the left hand, so that it would, on this ground alone, be most likely that Montelupo and no other was the author of this series, some of which, as we know, have from an early date been actually ascribed to him.

Another instrument to be used in the search for the authorship of drawings is handwriting. It must be used with the greatest caution, for handwriting, far

\* I should add that in the Santarelli Collection of the Uffizi [No. 570], there is a black chalk study by Montelupo of indisputable authenticity. It represents a statuesque youth wearing an antique cloak clasped over the right shoulder, and holding on a level with his head something in his hand. Here also the shading goes from left to right, and the left foot is drawn in the absurd way that has occurred so frequently among the drawings I have assigned to Montelupo.

† Vasari, iv. 552.

more than even graphic or plastic form, is in its general aspects characteristic of classes of men rather than of individuals. Handwritings will at first sight seem as identical as at first glance all Chinamen proverbially are, and it requires much of the unconscious study resulting from mere acquaintance, and a great deal of deliberate search of distinguishing peculiarities to differentiate one hand from another. The problem is rendered all the more difficult by the circumstance that there was in the sixteenth century, as there is to-day, much deliberate imitation of a great man's calligraphy. Michelangelo's hand, for instance, was no less aped by his followers than Mr. Whistler's has been in our own times. To use handwriting, therefore, as a test, is a task requiring no slight training, and no small skill, being indeed less difficult than connoisseurship itself only because the question of quality enters in for much less. With full knowledge, then, of the attending difficulties, after having carefully studied various specimens of Montelupo's writing, I do not hesitate to declare that the various words and phrases scribbled on Oxford No. 20 are his. It by no means follows that a drawing is of necessity by the person whose writing can be identified on the same sheet—and we shall presently meet with a flagrant instance to the contrary. But from the way the words on this drawing are placed, from the ink used, and the scarcely definable something of common touch that they have with the sketches, it is, to me at least, patent that they are by the same person.

We thus have three different arguments for Montelupo's authorship of this series of drawings: Some of them have apparently never been otherwise ascribed; they all are shaded with the left hand, and Montelupo was left-handed; the writing is Montelupo's. These proofs in the present instance suffice, for it is not as if we were attempting to ascribe drawings by Michelangelo to one whom that great master knew not. Montelupo's relations with him are known to all, and must have been intimate, for not only did he, Montelupo, work under Michelangelo at S. Lorenzo, doing for him the St. Damian there, but later, he was Michelangelo's principal assistant in the completion of the Tomb of Julius. Moreover, Vasari assures us that Montelupo was no mean draughtsman, and that, particularly in architectural ornament, he closely adhered to the manner of Michelangelo. Messer Giorgio, by the way, makes special mention of the chimney-pieces for the Castle of S. Angelo, and I have no doubt that Oxford No. 20 was for one of these.

If we look again at some of the sheets that I have ascribed to Montelupo, we shall find from the chronological side also ample confirmation of my hypothesis. The precise date when he entered Michelangelo's service is, I believe, unknown, but it was certainly before 1534, when the master left Florence for good. It was, as we recall, precisely in those two or three years preceding his departure that Michelangelo drew the Cavalieri and kindred designs, among them the Phaeton and the Children's Bacchanal. Of the latter, Oxford No. 52 is a complete copy; and Oxford No. 20 records, as I believe, part of a lost version, an earlier than any of the three still known of the former. What more likely than that the



pupil copied these designs not only while fresh but while to him accessible? Louvre No. 124 offers us copies of the S. Lorenzo Madonna from two different points of view; Oxford No. 43 presents a copy of the Twilight; and various anatomical studies on the same sheet, and elsewhere as well, are notes inspired by the great master's works in the Sacristy. What wonder if Montelupo, who tells us he drew all the antique remains of Rome, should have drawn after Michelangelo also, whom he certainly could have admired no less!

Persuaded now that the series of drawings that we have just been studying was made by Raffaelle da Montelupo, we can more safely increase their number by attaching those others which, also ascribed to Michelangelo, are less obviously by the same hand than those we have examined hitherto.

Uffizi No. 1232 we have seen to be a copy in black chalk after the S. Lorenzo Madonna, differing neither in attitude nor in general effect from that on Louvre No. 124, so that there can be but small legitimate doubt that it also is by Montelupo. In one important respect, however, it differs from all the pen-drawings by Montelupo: the shading here does not go from left to right but from right to left. It would seem, therefore, that Montelupo could, and occasionally did, draw with his right hand. We can give more substance to this seeming if we examine a sheet in the reserve of the Uffizi [No. 14530<sup>F</sup>], always ascribed to Montelupo, and amply authenticated by an inscription in a nearly contemporary hand, and with words and phrases in his own calligraphy. On the one side we see Cupid bending to the ground, engaged apparently in breaking his bow; an urn; various putti and a dog. On the other, the ground plan of a building and a slender young female. All these sketches were done with the pen, but in characteristic wise he has put on the head of the nude female with the crayon. But most of the shading on this figure goes from right to left, although in every other way it is so much like his left-handed work that you could believe it a mere reversal of that. In the ground plan, on the contrary, and on the Cupid the stroke is as usual from left to right, but in the urn and the putti again from right to left. Proof positive this that Montelupo could and did use both his hands, with the resulting proposition that whereas left-handed shading in a Michelangelesque drawing of 1525-1550 may point to Montelupo as its author, the contrary nevertheless does not follow, and that a sketch shaded with the right hand, provided it has his other characteristics, may yet be by him.

Let us now examine a few such drawings. Perhaps as interesting as any is Oxford No. 45, covered on both sides in black chalk with various sketches and scrawls, some of them for children's toys. The shading is from right to left, but there is no lack of counterbalancing proof of Montelupo's authorship. Thus the Hellenising profile and Mercury's head should be compared with the one on Oxford No. 43; the horse with the one on Oxford No. 20; the schematic profiles for a study in optics with a similar profile in the Uffizi sheet last mentioned; the two studies for legs with those on Oxford Nos. 20, 49 and 52, Uffizi Nos. 1228 and 1231.

Two studies after the owl perched beside Michelangelo's Night indicate that, like many another of Montelupo's drawings, this one was done while he was aiding his master at S. Lorenzo; and to establish conclusively that this sheet was drawn and left in Michelangelo's studio, we have the fact that on one side, written in ink over the more childish sketches in crayon, we find a whole madrigal in Buonarroti's own hand. What this demonstrates beyond dispute is that this sheet was left in his studio, for he must have taken it up, as was his wont, when he required paper, for he was accustomed to pick up the first leaf he laid hands on, whether wholly clear or not. And herein we have a sign of the intimate relation between the two artists, such as no other source of information offers; and, at the same time, we are given a confirmation of the statement I ventured to make a little while ago, that a drawing is not necessarily by the person whose handwriting occurs on the same sheet.

We shall now be the less surprised to find several other drawings by Montelupo in which the shading entirely or in part goes from right to left. Thus Louvre No. 111 has on one side a figure closely imitated after Michelangelo's Tityus, and on the other what passes for a sketch of one of the façades for the New Sacristy of S. Lorenzo. But the touch and the mannerism seem decidedly Montelupo's. I would call special attention to the whole right leg of the nude. Oxford No. 51 contains the anatomical study in pen and charcoal of a left leg, two more or less grotesque profiles, two slight sketches for a female nude, one for a triton, and the bust of an oldish man which passes for a portrait of Michelangelo. Under this is written in Montelupo's hand the familiar epistolary phrase, "Al mio quanto fratello."<sup>\*</sup> But beside this and the general impression, the anatomical foot so like those in Oxford Nos. 20, 49 and 52 goes far to establish Montelupo's claim to this drawing. Oxford No. 57 contains on one side Jupiter embracing Ganymede, and on the other a torso seen from the back, various grotesque masks and a couple of scrawls for nudes. On this side the general effect, the likeness of the grotesques to those on Louvre No. 124 verso, and the left-handed shading suffice to persuade us that the hand is Montelupo's. The Jupiter and Ganymede on the other side are obviously by the same draughtsman, although here some, by no means all, the shading goes from right to left. Finally Oxford No. 66 is an essay at a restoration of the Vatican torso, doubtless copied from Michelangelo.<sup>†</sup> The handling is Montelupo's, and the grotesque head, added probably of his own invention, resembles the grotesque on the last Oxford sheet [No. 57 verso].

<sup>\*</sup> Sir Chas. Robinson, unacquainted with this phrase, supposed it to mean "that the likeness resembled Michelangelo like a brother." The very peculiar A suffices by itself to prove that the writing is Montelupo's. Compare it with the A under the arch in Uffizi No. 4366 arch. The phrase or part of it recurs in Montelupo's drawings, as for instance, on Uffizi No. 14530<sup>r</sup>. The identical A occurs in Oxford No. 43 verso.

<sup>†</sup> I infer this from the fact that Alessandro Allori has introduced the same figure done with slight changes of attitude into a splendid decorative design in the Uffizi [No. 4500], and that Uffizi No. 17391, but for the absence of a head identical with this, is a copy on a much larger scale, perhaps by Daniele da Volterra, after an original clearly by Michelangelo. Allori by the way must have had a peculiar taste for this figure, for he places it as a show-piece in the forefront of his Feast of Scipio at Poggio à Cajano.

## VIII

A hard and dry but clever draughtsman, to whose identity I have been able to discover no clue, reveals himself in a series of some eight or ten black chalk drawings, passing as original sketches for the Last Judgment, but really done for the most part after the fresco. Once or twice he betrays acquaintance with studies by the master for bits finally abandoned, which would lead one to suppose that this draughtsman, whoever he was, must at this time have been in intimate relations with Michelangelo, perhaps assisting him.\*

More interesting by far is the series of brilliant studies in the Uffizi, chiefly after the Last Judgment and the Pauline frescoes. They were drawn by some very clever person who had the wit to form his manner on that phase of Michelangelo's draughtsmanship which, in some respects, seems to me the most admirable—the phase revealed to us by the British Museum sheet of splendid hard chalk studies for various nudes, busts, and a group of reclining figures, all done in a curvilinear system of moulding, defining, functioning contours. This or that single best one of these Uffizi sketches might easily pass as Michelangelo's, without perhaps raising the suspicions of even the special student; but, examined together, they betray the able calligraphist rather than the draughtsman, the person who has a splendid hand but no eye of his own. And in truth this series has never, in good earnest, been ascribed to Michelangelo himself. Apparently, Baldinucci knew that they were mere imitations, and, as a matter of fact, I know but one single drawing from this hand which still passes as Michelangelo's. It is a sketch (belonging to Mr. Walter Gay, of Paris), after the demon carrying a person thrown over his shoulder, of a quality really so excellent that one can well understand why it has been attributed to the great master. Yet a careful comparison with the Uffizi set will discover the identity with those.

It has been suggested by Milanese that the author of these clever drawings may have been a certain Leonardo Cungi† of Borgo S. Sepolcro, who, Vasari informs us, made such admirable sketches after Michelangelo's paintings in the Sistine Chapel that Pierino del Vaga kept them in his own collection until his death, in 1547, when they were sold by his heirs. The only other scrap of information about Cungi that books will yield, is Vasari's statement that after 1560 he was among the painters who decorated the pavilion of the Belvedere. To me this suggestion of Milanese's seems plausible. Evidently this set of Uffizi

\* Here is a list of these drawings. For further information consult catalogue.

*Haarlem.* Nos. 10<sup>a</sup> and 10<sup>b</sup>. Two torsos.

*Lille.* A floating figure with bent arm before him.

*London.* British Museum. Various floating figures.

Torso of a figure looking up, and two arms.

*Oxford.* No. 58. Prostrate nude trying to get up.

*Windsor.* Study for demon in half-kneeling posture.

A nude lifting himself on his hands from behind.  
Malcolm Collection No. 68, study for a demon.

† Ed. Sansoni, v. p. 632.



drawings has always been kept together, and it contains not only a large number after the Last Judgment, but copies as well after the Children's Bacchanal, the Phaeton, and other cartoons done for Tommaso Cavalieri—which, by the way, speaks for a personal intimacy between Cungi and Michelangelo's circle—and also after the Pauline frescoes. As none of these drawings point to a later date than that of Pierino's death—for Cungi, if a friend, surely could have got access to the Paolina before these frescoes were quite finished and uncovered—it is possible that they are the ones that belonged to Pierino, in which case they certainly would be by Cungi.\*

## IX

Battista Franco, Marcello Venusti, and Daniele da Volterra, known either as pupils and assistants, or, at least, as followers of Michelangelo, are draughtsmen whom we should expect to be the real authors of many a drawing assigned to the master; but as a matter of fact, few sketches by these painters are anywhere seriously ascribed to Michelangelo himself. I shall speak here of the very few that still enjoy such high consideration.

The only one of importance to be ascribed to Franco is the famous Prudence of the Uffizi [No. 614]. This well-known and frequently reproduced design represents a youngish woman seated in profile to right looking into a glass which she holds before her. One putto kneels behind her, and another stands by her half frightened, and wholly fascinated by a third who comes near enough to be touched, covering his own face with an inverted satyr's mask. The invention is clearly Michelangelo's, and his original must have been designed soon after the completion of the Ceiling, for the types and the forms point to that date; but the execution is certainly by the hand which made the various sketches that tradition has always assigned to Franco. It has in common with these the occasional excessive tenuity of the line, the density of the hatching, and the hardening of the contour. Like other sheets ascribed to Franco, this also is in all probability one of those copies which Vasari tells us Battista made after any and every scrap of Michelangelo's handiwork that he could get sight of.

Marcello Venusti seems to me to be the author of two other famous designs in the Uffizi, an Annunciation [No. 229] and a Christ in the Garden [No. 230], both of which may be identical with the ones mentioned by Vasari as being by Michelangelo, wherefore, perhaps, they still pass almost unquestioned under that name. Elsewhere I have tried to give my reasons for taking them both away

\* Nearly all of them have been photographed in his good old way by Philpot, and I add his numbers of the more interesting: 1289, 1292, 1293, 1295, 1298, 1299, 1300, 1301, 1302, 1303, 1305, 1306, 1307, 2586, 2587, 2588, 2589, 2590. It will be observed on comparing these sketches with the paintings that they seldom agree exactly. The differences may be due to the furious haste of the lightning calligraphist, or to fraudulent intention. It is, however, not inconceivable that one or two sketches like those for the Crucifixion of Peter [Nos. 17366, 17367, photos. 1305, 1306] may be copies not after the executed work but after original designs by Michelangelo, now lost.

from the great master and assigning them to the imitator (see Catalogue, under "School of Michelangelo"). Here the bare record of my venture must suffice.

Daniele da Volterra is the author of few if any designs still seriously ascribed to Michelangelo. The only one we need note here is the remarkable study in the Louvre [No. d'Ordre 2716] for an Entombment, which I have discussed at sufficient length in the appended catalogue.

## X

I have by no means exhausted the list of those imitators, all excepting Venusti Florentines, who should be included in a complete account of Michelangelo's school. But I have no such stupendous task in view. My chief purpose in this chapter has been to discuss the more important drawings that still seriously pass as Michelangelo's, although certainly not by him. None of these had for their authors such close followers as Pontormo, Bronzino and Rosso.\* But as these artists will on their own account meet with separate treatment, we can overlook them here, and pass on to finish this review with a word about a Bolognese, a number of whose designs still find acceptance as Michelangelo's, and find it because, as I believe, they were, the best of them, made with the intention that they should, and made admirably.

The Bolognese in question was Bartolommeo Passerotti, who, as master of the Carracci, may in a sense be considered the second founder of the Bolognese School—and of that section thereof which, as it already is well to remind younger students, for two centuries enjoyed such favour that not a hundred years ago a noble English lord who had the choice of a Carracci and a deservedly famous Titian, took the Carracci. Were we to believe certain persons who, they also, are critics, we now are guilty of gross injustice to these Bolognese, and we are warned to repent. I for one mean to remain stiff-necked, even when the exigencies of the picture-market will, as it well may, have once again restored these mannerists to fashion. I mean to remain obdurate, because, while I try to do justice to a mannerist of no matter what clime or date, I can never consider him an artist—and happily there is more real art in this world than I can hope to enjoy sufficiently in the course of a lifetime.

Who has intelligently looked at the Carracci, Guercino, Guido, and their following, and denied their cleverness, their learning, their dexterity, even their accomplishment? Admirable as I find their paintings, their drawings seem to me still more admirable. Nevertheless, I have yet to see a late Bolognese drawing which betrays a serious artistic intention, a drawing which I should consider as much as bad. To be "bad" is to have failed of something that it had been one's deliberate or unconscious purpose to do; but these Bolognese fail of nothing.

\* The well-known Uffizi design for a Fortune [No. 609] seems to me Bronzinesque rather than by Bronzino.

Their real purpose was to be not draughtsmen but penmen, and in this, although they attained no such signal success as the frank calligraphists of the East or of our own Trecento, yet they reached a respectable and even engaging mediocrity. But penmanship is not draughtsmanship, and will not be through all eternity.

Passerotti, the founder of the later more famous Bolognese School, betrays in the various and fairly numerous drawings correctly ascribed to him, all the calligraphic accomplishment\* with all the essential dryness and emptiness that characterise the designs of his more famous followers. Yet they found at once, and even at Florence, ardent admirers, who began to collect them for the great merits they perceived in them, applying to them the same terms of praise that they had but just given to Michelangelo himself. But Passerotti did not arrive at this admired manner of his at a bound. In Rome, whither he wandered and remained for a time, he must certainly have studied not only Michelangelo's paintings but even his drawings. How did he get hold of the latter? Perhaps he had access to collections, these having in the third quarter of the sixteenth century already become fairly numerous; perhaps he was lent them by unscrupulous dealers with deliberate orders to study and imitate their manner.

Thus, I cannot but believe that the two very famous designs at Oxford for Sibyls [Nos. 30, 31]<sup>†</sup> which until the other day when Professor Wickhoff recognised them as Passerotti's passed for Michelangelo's—I cannot believe that these two drawings were done without the deliberate intention of fraud. They are admirable imitations of Michelangelo's early manner of draughtsmanship, and they contain all those variations from any of the executed Sibyls, which apparently the dealer of that time no less than the dealer of to-day would assure his clients were the infallible sign of a genuine sketch. But of course the forger does not fail to betray himself. Here it is in the too fierce stroke of the pen, in certain tricks of drapery, and in certain passages of yawning dullness.<sup>‡</sup>

It is, on the other hand, not at all likely that a fraudulent purpose gave the impulse to yet another famous sheet at Oxford No. 4, which also passed unquestioned as Michelangelo's until Professor Wickhoff came and with every good reason assigned it to Passerotti. On one side are hands and the back of a nude, and on the other more hands and various nudes (Plate cliv.). As a forgery it would be a failure, and I do not know from what point of view, except for its value as a scarecrow to students, to praise it. Manifestly the author of these

\* There is in the Uffizi an album of large designs by Passerotti, remarkable of their kind.

† For further information concerning, and much fuller discussion of, these and other sketches mentioned in the rest of this section, see Catalogue under "School of Michelangelo."

‡ Probably a similar purpose inspired the sheet at the Uffizi [No. 615] which is covered with sketches supposed to be for the decorative nudes in the Ceiling. That they are by a mannerist there can, I believe, be but little doubt, and a careful comparison with the mass of Passerotti's sketches, not omitting Uffizi No. 6145, nearly convinces me that they also are by him, done, of course, after the figures in the Ceiling, but with such really original sketches in mind as the one for these same nudes now at the British Museum. Fraud again may have been the motive for the Louvre sketch of a nude female sitting on her heels, looking into a mirror [No. d'Ordre 726]. This study, however, although clearly Passerotti's, is yet so very Michelangelesque that it may more plausibly be regarded as a copy made faithfully but frankly after a now lost early original by the great master.



sketches has studied not only Michelangelo, but drawings by Montelupo as well, and others still, certainly far more to his taste, by that father of so many art-lies, Baccio Bandinelli. The forms and the shading both remind me of this one mere penman of the whole Florentine School, and like him Passerotti is apt in a given design to fall into some one trick, as fancy takes him, of monotonous stroke. Thus here on the back the trick is to zig-zag along as closely as possible and for as long as possible without lifting the pen. On the left-hand corner of the front it is to end the stroke with a hook. In Oxford No. 3 the three nudes are done with nothing but a combination of these two tricks. In the sheet of grotesque animals at the Louvre [No. d'Ordre 719] we have nothing but pot-hooks again.

It has been Passerotti's fate—a fate too frequently allotted by ignorance to forgers and imitators—that, as well as his sketches done after or in imitation of Michelangelo although with no intention of fraud, others done quite independently have been ascribed to and still pass as by the greater master, because the same workmanship is instinctively felt in all. Thus, in the Uffizi alone, two studies for prophets [Nos. 14750, 14769] crude imitations of Michelangelo's figures, and a woman embracing a child while another looks over her shoulder [No. 17369], copied with the addition of one child from one of the Sixtine lunettes, are still attributed to the great Florentine, although the stroke is so clearly Passerotti's. His also and unmistakably are No. 242, a study of hands in prayer, No. 247, sketch for a "Pietà," a running nude and a putto, and No. 246, a sketch of a right hand, none of which have any relation to any work really by Michelangelo.

And this last-named sketch of a hand is not only clearly by Passerotti but at the same time by the author of the most famous of all Italian drawings of hands, the one in the Louvre ascribed to Michelangelo [No. d'Ordre 717]. As Professor Wickhoff has already recognised this also as Passerotti's and given very good reasons for his attribution, we need not dwell upon it here.

To Professor Wickhoff again we owe the attribution of yet another famous drawing to a mannerist, to Bartolommeo Manfredi. It is the sketch for an anatomical demonstration [Oxford No. 50].

The name of a worse and even cleverer mannerist than any of these, the name of Luca Cambiaso, has by Morelli been brought into connection with Michelangelo. I, at least, have never seen a drawing by the former seriously ascribed to the latter. Indeed, as great mistakes require great people to make them, it was left to Morelli to attribute to Cambiaso one of the most remarkable of Michelangelo's own designs. It is the Oxford study [No. 1] of Three Men Conversing.

## CHAPTER XI

### ANDREA DEL SARTO AND OTHERS

VASARI cites as a great rarity a finished drawing in bistre by Andrea del Sarto. Both the medium and the elaboration must have been unusual to demand such attention, and Messer Giorgio feels that he must explain why they are so singular; for he goes on to say that Andrea's habit was to prepare himself for painting, not by making highly finished conventionalised drawings to be copied into his pictures, but by jotting down rapidly all that he saw in the model, with which sketch-notes to serve him as reminders he then directly laid in and painted.\*

Exact and clear statement was not among Vasari's gifts, and my interpretation of his words may be subject to dispute. Yet I venture to believe that it is in substance correct, for not only have I tried to give what would seem to be the one probable meaning of his lines, but I find ample confirmation of this rendering in Andrea's accessible extant drawings. From his own hand I have not discovered a single sketch done with any medium like bistre or wash of any sort, nor anything which could possibly be regarded as a finished design. Of course he must have made such, but their total disappearance argues how rarely. Excepting one small head in ink [Uffizi No. 34], his drawings are in red chalk, and, less frequently, in black. Both these materials are peculiarly adapted to rapid sketching, but red would seem to enjoy an advantage over black in that it will yield, or at least has by Florentine draughtsmen been made to yield, quicker and more certain response to every slightest variation of pressure made by the hand. With red chalk you could dash down some idea that was quickening your mind; with red chalk you could shade broadly when you liked, as when you wished to note quickly yet accurately all the folds of a drapery you had flung over your model; with red chalk, if you had the gift, you could delineate a contour as with a quill, making it fainter and fainter when you liked, and giving such accent that your line should seem not drawing, but the infallible registration, made automatically by your nerves, of your acts of most searching vision—as infallible, as inevitable, as clear as the sound of the bell when struck by the hammer.

\* Vasari, v. p. 57.

If this be a fair description of what can be achieved with red chalk, if in the hand of the artist it can become an almost vitalised instrument, a kind of elongation of his fingers, then a given draughtsman's great preference for this instrument cannot be without significance. Such a predilection surely implies that this craftsman would never regard drawing as its own end, that he would seldom commit the solecism of a finished shaded design, and that he drew but to note and record fancies of his mind when they came, or more frequently what he actually saw. We should also be right, I think, in expecting of this artist a sovereign interest in the exact formation and structure of the object occupying his field of vision, and this object we should expect him to limn with a contour that will make us feel as if he were combining the swiftness and precision of sight with the intimacy and pressure of physical contact.

It may be that I am endowing red chalk with qualities not universally inherent in the material, with qualities at all events that have been found therein only by the greatest draughtsmen. Between it however and Andrea's hand there certainly was something like a pre-established harmony. The description I have tried to give of the effects it will yield may or may not apply to the works of others who have used it, but applies almost unfailingly to his own drawings, and to those of his riper years most literally. Such contours as you shall find in his various sketches for *The Last Supper*, or in the Uffizi leaflet with nude boys [Plate clv.], are, for the searching out of bone and muscle under its excellent envelope of flesh, scarcely to be paralleled in even the most realistic of great moderns; and I doubt whether this distinctness, combined with a depth of relief comparable to the ablest results of undercutting achieved by a Donatello or a Desiderio, could have been produced by any other material than red chalk.

Be all this as it may, Vasari's statement certainly is justified by such of Andrea's authentic drawings as I have had access to. Not one of them is laboriously finished; not one could have been made with the intention of being by itself a source of pleasure or interest; two only, and these of early date, an *Epiphany* and a *Resurrection* [Uffizi Nos. 667, 630], are designs of any considerable elaboration for an entire scene. As a rule, his sketches of whole compositions must have been scrawled with such haste as we find in Mr. Heseltine's transcendently masterly foreshadowing of the *Madonna di Porta à Pinti*, and studies for the *Madonna del Sacco*, or with such offhand ease and privacy of purpose as appear in the small Uffizi note for the *Annunziata Procession of the Magi* [No. 334] and the *Scalzo Decapitation of the Baptist* [No. 321].

All the other authentic drawings by Andrea known to me are studies of detail, seldom of more than a part of a figure. A torso, an arm, a hand, a head, a cast of drapery make up the greater number; infrequently a single figure, studied not merely for the pose or drapery, but for its own sake; very rarely indeed a whole



nude. So rare indeed are these last, that, although steeped at the present moment in Andrea, I cannot offhand recall more than five or six of his sketches approaching the kind known as "Academies." If we assume, as the law of averages bids us, that the proportion of nudes among his drawings is no less now than it ever was, we must come to the rather startling conclusion that the nude for its own sake could have had little interest for this artist.

A great Florentine draughtsman of the earliest years of the Cinquecento, without an interest in the nude for its own sake, is a phenomenon to note, and if possible to explain.

Vasari says of Franciabigio that he was an excellent draughtsman because in the summer time he drew from the nude. Here is suggested a physical difficulty to be piled on top of all the mental obstructions to the study of the nude. Not only did the Renaissance artist have a hard struggle in taking scale after scale from off his mind's eye until his untrained vision could behold nature in some such aspect as at last he learned to perceive it, but his time for working from the model wholly nude must have been limited to the few summer months. Hence, if for no other reason—and there are strong æsthetic reasons as well, of which the painter was dimly, if at all, aware—he was, from the start, driven to work a great part of the year from accumulated sketches and even from memory, with the inevitable conventionalisation thus resulting. But as conventionalisation is of the very essence of art, it was no evil that the painter was forced to it no less by necessity than by creative impulse; for much as we can do of set purpose, perhaps more still is done for us by the eliminating and harmonising processes of almost unconscious mind. Yet, although unconscious, these processes are not utterly beyond our control. As the skilful vintner will, by introducing into his vat the fermenting principle of a superior wine, obtain a vintage excellent beyond the unaided nature of his grape, so can we, by attending to the example of our elders and betters, set up in our minds finer processes of cerebration than our minds of themselves would initiate. All study of the achievements of the past implies some such justification for itself, and at no time could the past as a principle of superior fermentation have been more helpful than was the Antique to the artists of the Renaissance. It was doubtless during the many months when they could not work from the completely stripped model, and had to fall back so much upon memory, that the Antique mingling with the stock of visual imagery stored up by memory, and getting what control it could of this stock, led little by little, and almost unconsciously, to the formation of the modern, the still prevalent canon of the nude, once exultingly, now almost vituperatively, known as the "Academic."

I am fairly launched, I see, upon a treatise on the psychology of the artist, and it were high time I returned to my humbler task; yet before leaving this fascinating stream of thought, must I dip into it once more to bring up the suggestion that the possession of a vigorous visual memory is indispensable to the artist in the broader sense of that word. Without this gift a man may be an

excellent draughtsman, even a remarkable painter, but it may be questioned whether, without visual memory, he will ever be a good designer, or even a master of movement and action. You cannot merely copy any action while the model waits. All delineation of movement is necessarily a product of imagination depending upon memory. And how much more still does all this apply to composition!

Examine Andrea's paintings. They are not exactly without good composition, nor will you be tempted to find them inadequate in action, yet you will scarcely judge these to be their title to admiration. In both composition and action Andrea's earlier works just escape blame; and his maturer ones, those particularly which, like the *Madonna del Sacco*, the now vanished *Madonna di Porta à Pinti*, and two or three of the *Scalzo* frescoes, must have been done under the almost transubstantiating influence of Michelangelo, are indeed sublime, yet scarcely of the very highest order. At his best, Andrea is never quite simple, quite persuasive enough; and when he attempts the great manner, he becomes, as in the frescoes I have just mentioned, or in the *Madonna delle Arpie*, a trifle too grandiose to be really grand. In his noblest achievements I feel a certain lack of imagination, and hence I would derive many of his faults, as his too obvious design, his bravura when he attempts magnificence, and his dumbness; for say what you will, his paintings, with the rarest exceptions, are like very beautiful deaf and dumb creatures. When at their very best, you think they will speak. They never do.

So perhaps the timidity which Vasari so much regretted in Andrea may have been not only a fault of character; it may have been due to a deeper fault of mind. The man may have known himself better than did his neighbours. If no more conscious process, then at least the usual inversion of the ratios of effort to achievement, must have taught him that he was apt to be least himself when composing a magnificent design requiring ennobled animated action, and most himself when doing something very unpretending and limited.

Glance at one of his most deservedly famous pictures, the *Mourning over the Dead Christ* in the Pitti. In colour and tone it is more pictorial, a nearer approach to Venetian painting than any Florentine work whatsoever, except one or two by Andrea himself. It is not bad as composition, but not very good either, and certainly no master of the highest order would have tolerated the two erect figures. We shall bestow no great praise upon the action: Paul is grandiose after the manner of Sebastiano del Piombo; the dead Christ remains unsupported, and is not really relaxed. Both these faults in a contemporary of Michelangelo's can be accounted for only by absence of imaginative power. Yet, bit by bit, the nude figure is exquisite, although he is not quite—so to speak—of a piece; and of the picture as a whole, the same remark holds true: bit by bit, but not as a whole, it is excellent.

Enough! Why carry the analysis further, and show that the draperies, so beautiful in themselves, are yet there to conceal rather than to enhance the nude?

It is time we began to understand what Andrea really was. A great artist he certainly was not, nor a great painter either. In the sense in which Pollajuolo and Michelangelo were draughtsmen he was not even a great draughtsman. In the strictest use of the word "painter" no Florentine was a great painter, and Andrea was a Florentine. To be a great artist requires imagination, to be a great draughtsman demands visual memory at least, and study of Andrea's life and works almost persuades me that he had little of either—if indeed one of these gifts be separable from the other. Yet there was just one thing Andrea could do as no one had done it before him, and as perhaps no one has done it since : he could draw from the model so as to give you its very pulse-beat, so that it seemed the automatic registration of nerve-contact rather than representation. But subject to the model, he did well only what could be done before fatigue brought about change of pose. Hence Andrea is at his best only in this or that detail quickly done ; hence also the great rarity of a complete nude.

In studies of detail from the model then, Andrea has no rival, and it is to a great treat that we have prepared ourselves, for the bulk of his drawings is of such details. As neither imagination, composition, nor indeed even action come into question, they will seldom if ever remind us of his failings. As matchlessly vital transcripts of reality we shall enjoy them, if we have the gift and training.

## II

We shall first look at Andrea's sketches for his frescoes, then at the studies for his various altar-pieces and easel pictures, glancing occasionally at the more interesting drawings which I have not succeeded in bringing into connection with any work known to me. I shall refrain from more than a word or two of criticism or appreciation, for what I have already said of Andrea's general style applies to every particular sketch, and I like not repetition. I shall, however, not be so chary of pointing to proofs of my already stated conclusions regarding Andrea as an artist.

The five frescoes at the Annunziata which recount the legend of St. Philip Benizzi are among Andrea's earliest works, indeed the earliest of known date. They were finished in 1510. They reveal a pretty talent for pleasant landscape and graceful figures, comparable to nothing else in Italian art so much as to the temper shown by Sodoma in his then recent paintings at Monteoliveto, with the difference, however, that while the Lombard is at times almost ravishing, the Tuscan, who never rises above amiable prose, gradually unfolds a greater seriousness of artistic purpose. Yet that earnestness would seem imposed or even juxtaposed, for it has not leavened the whole, but appears side by side with it. I refer chiefly to the architectural backgrounds of the last three of the series. They are nobly conceived and ably executed, and greatly enhance the pleasure we take in these



frescoes as a whole; but the figures, not lifted to their scale, and not fused with their lines, look all the meaner—a subject race taking their ease in the halls of their absent lords. Michelangelo is reported to have said, referring to Andrea, that he knew a youngster in Florence who could make Raphael look to his paces. The mighty Florentine, with the hearty narrowness of supreme creative genius, must have been an unusually poor critic of what, in the field of art, lay beyond the sublime limits of his own endeavour. Else, how could he have fancied that the designer of the “School of Athens” had aught to fear from the painter of St. Phillip’s legend? But such transfiguration as Raphael could induce figures to bestow upon architecture, and especially architecture upon figures, may well have seemed to Michelangelo an almost contemptible trick whereby to hide what to him was the one unpardonable, the one irremediable evil, namely, poverty of drawing. As a draughtsman, it is true, Andrea turned the tables upon Raphael, and Michelangelo’s estimate is to be explained, if not excused; but Andrea himself seems to have fostered no illusions regarding his own place; for later, when visiting Rome, he ran away, nearly desperate over what seemed to him the superiority of even the pupils of Raphael. And, indeed, in his maturer years, when he was at his best as a draughtsman, whether instinctively or deliberately, he almost ostentatiously, as in the finer Scalzo frescoes, discarded what he could of architectural backgrounds, contenting himself with mere partitions, which indeed suffice—when the figures are great enough.

Nor can it in candour be said that the drawing in these Annunziata frescoes, if we had them quite isolated in our minds and unassociated with the name of Andrea, would call for any signal meed of praise. It is perhaps *senza errori*, but many of the figures are awkward, as if badly pieced together, and the draperies tend to be mean or entirely superfluous. Doubtless the studies of detail, which the painter must have made to help him build up these figures, were already admirable, but none have come to my view. I know only two sketches for these works, but both are among his rare studies after entire nude figures. One in the Uffizi [No. 312] is for the leper whom we see in the first of these frescoes, in the middle distance on the left, trembling with cold and fear before St. Phillip and his companion. It is somewhat tame, although better than the finished figure, from which, by the way, it differs in trifles. Its chief interest perhaps is that it is the earliest sketch by Andrea, the exact date of which is known. The other nude, of more importance [Louvre, No. 45, Plate clvi.], is for the almost naked figure who is conspicuous in the scene where St. Phillip exorcises a possessed woman. There he is as uncalled for an “academy” as you shall easily find. In red chalk, without the strips of drapery which, in the painting, change him from a nude to a naked creature, he stands well joined, not bony yet firm, of splendid enveloping contours, ably modelled. Nowhere a niggling touch, but also nowhere quite the spark of life. No significant action, no clear intention, simply an excellent transcript of the model.

The next work for which I have found preparatory drawings is the Procession of the Magi, painted in 1511, a work in which Andrea shows progress. The grouping is subtler, the figures are more in harmony with their surroundings, and the freshness and gaiety are not troubled by even such blemishes as the youth in the foremost foreground who looks at us while staggering under the load of his own draperies. The Uffizi [No. 334] treasures up the small sketch I have already mentioned as being one of Andrea's rare ones for a whole or considerable part of a composition. It is a first thought, jotted down with unconscious ease, in simple strokes, searching to record the arrangement and the action as it occurred to the artist's mind. Of the single figures, only the two white kings remain unaltered in the fresco. The group on the right had to vanish before the Florentine pest of obvious portraiture.\*

A much larger and completer design, not for the Procession but the Adoration of the Magi [Uffizi, No. 667], is also supposed to have been drawn in connection with this same fresco. But not only does the difference of subject preclude this opinion, but the drawing seems to me of earlier date—for in certain tricks of hand, as in the way the Madonna's head is rendered, I seem to recognise the still fresh influence of Pier di Cosimo—and, if earlier, then it is an eloquent witness to Andrea's early maturity as a draughtsman. It is one of his rare sketches for complete compositions consisting of many figures. The arrangement is simple and unassuming, but clear, lively, and well fitted to Andrea's rather boyish conception of the subject. Here there are none of those thronging greybeards that we find in Leonardo, coming burthened with the thoughts and desires of a lifetime, nor those Orientals, majestic in their dignity, that Gentile Bellini has painted, but a gay scene of country jollity, of almost German heartiness: you could well fancy that one of the attendants comes running in—yodelling. But while the figures are in every way charming, they are not my chief interest in this admirable design. That is claimed by the landscape, which is so distanced, so constructed, so convincingly real, that I could almost point out the exact nook in the Val di Mugnone, looking toward Monte Senario, where Andrea must have sat to do it; and indeed the contours of the separate ridges all have that accent of intimate contact with the thing seen that I find elsewhere only when he was drawing from the model.

Some ten or more years later, Andrea must again have treated this subject, as would appear from two drawings of the same size, one in red chalk at the Louvre [No. 44] and the other at the Uffizi [No. 634], in bistre wash and white. The first is certainly by Battista Naldini, who, although a devoted admirer and copyist of Andrea, was a pupil of Pontormo, which fact accounts for certain traits in this design that quite correctly have led students not acquainted with the apprentice to descry therein his master's manner, and therefore his hand. The washed sketch has no

\* For the figure with the head of Jacopo Sansovino there is a rapid sketch in black chalk at the Uffizi [No. 6435, Cat. ii.].

character but that of a faithful copy, but the relation of the one to the other is not without interest. They are too much alike in scale, and all that scale implies, to be independent versions after a completed painting. It would seem more probable that both were copies of a lost original, which original was perhaps one of those highly finished designs in wash and white whose exceeding rarity Vasari marked. The date of the lost work can be determined with ease, for the Madonna recalls the one called "del Sacco," and the other, now destroyed, but once known as "di Porta à Pinti," while the remaining figures, in type, structure, and pose, recall the later Scalzo frescoes. These two drawings would thus seem to record a not unimportant work by Andrea conceived about 1522. In the years that intervened since he made the delightful early sketch for the Adoration, Andrea had nearly completed his orbit, destined happily never to pass much below the zenith. At this point do we now find him. What those swift transforming and transmuting years—swifter perhaps than any others in the history of art—what the vicinity of Michelangelo could do for him, they have done. Andrea also is here a designer and adept of the grand style, and his achievement is of value, even of great value, yet not of a value to make me forget the freshness and the bloom of that earlier rustic jollity and wholeheartedness.

For the maturest and most admirable of Andrea's Annunziata frescoes, that Birth of the Virgin whose loveliest figure, a young woman seated looking out, is no unworthy sister of Raphael's Madonna del Prato, for this work no sketches of any sort remain, the one at the Uffizi [No. 636] being a copy done by a much later hand after the corresponding episode in the painting.

### III

The monochrome decorations recounting on the walls of the inner court of the Scalzo the legend of the Baptist seem to have been begun as early as 1509 by Andrea, together with Franciabigio, then his bosom friend and partner. It would, moreover, appear that at so early a date in their career the difference in their talents had not yet become, as it did a few years later, obvious; and indeed in the earliest of these mural paintings, the one depicting the Baptism of our Lord, Franciabigio's hand seems to have been the ruling one.\*

Perhaps even before this fresco was finished, the work was suspended, but for not quite so long as the blind following of documents would lead us to believe. Thus, the earliest record of payment published by Milanesi is that of November 1515 for the Preaching of the Baptist and the Justice. Of the Charity no mention is made by name either then or later, and Milanesi, without so much as asking himself whether two works of such different spirit, style, and execution could have

\* This important observation, first made many years ago by Cavalcaselle, seems to have passed unnoticed, and deserves repeating. Only the landscape in this monochrome—it is, by the way, of no small interest—would seem to show the inspiration although scarcely the design of Andrea. The Baptist may be of later date than the rest.



been by the same human being, obeying ordinary laws of mind, designed in the same year, relegates it to the same date as the Faith, 1520. But this Charity could not have been planned later than the famous one in the Louvre; for the tendency of Andrea's advancing career was steadily away from his instinctive narrative style to one as dignified, as grand, as monumental as he could achieve. On this line of march I find the Scalzo Charity behind the other, and there are reasons even more tangible for assigning it to an earlier date.

In the first place, taking outside evidence, there can be no doubt that this fresco was finished before October 30, 1516, for on that day Andrea was paid a certain sum for finishing the ornament over four paintings described as complete, one of which certainly was the Charity (Vasari, *Le Monnier*, viii. p. 302); and Vasari distinctly names the Charity as among the first of Andrea's paintings in the Scalzo. True, he couples it with the Justice, and at once we part company with him, for the latter figure in intention, monumental pose, and action proclaims that it is a later work than the other. But as the date of this figure is known to be 1515, the other must be yet earlier.

Then, turning to evidence from within, search carefully through Andrea's authentic works and you will find nowhere else such close parallels to this Charity as occur in the Dresden Marriage of St. Catherine [No. 76], and the Borghese Madonna with the Infant Baptist [No. 334]. The women and the children are in all three paintings of the same type, the same jolliness with a little too much grimace, the same chubbiness. Even as action it is worth while noting the singular resemblance of the fresco to the Borghese panel. Now the two pictures in question, although of no certified date, were yet indisputably painted between the completion of the Annunziata Procession of the Magi and the Pitti Annunciation with the three Angels [No. 124], in other words, between 1511 and 1513—and there is thus no reason for assigning the Charity to a later date than 1513. Indeed the style is sufficiently less mature to give grounds for supposing it to have been designed a year earlier.\*

I have purposely used the word "designed," for, if I mistake not, this monochrome was left unfinished in 1512, and completed later, toward 1515. In his earlier years, Andrea in his paintings has outlines, but scarcely contours. Under the dominant influence of the school headed by Michelangelo, Andrea also tried hard to become more plastic, and succeeded. There is thus, in his earlier works, more purely pictorial merit, and much more charm; while his later have far more

\* In the Uffizi there is a red chalk sketch of a charming nude female with a child gambolling beside her [No. 341]. There it passes as Andrea's study for the Charity. It is, in fact, an early drawing by Pontormo; and if done, as is most likely, while he was still with Andrea, and betraying the influence of some original drawing for the Charity, it helps to fix the date of that work, for Pontormo was with Andrea in 1512-1513. Another observation I have made not altogether unworthy of attention is that the Charity in the drapery round her naked breast, as well as the Pitti Annunciation in the two companion Angels, betrays acquaintance with the same work, namely, the Manchester Madonna, which in the National Gallery is still ascribed to Michelangelo, although it certainly is not by him, and very likely by Bugiardini. This also would point to the two works being of the same date. That of the Annunciation is 1512-1513.

style, far more structure, and—derived from a mastery, at times supreme, over contours—much greater clearness of demarcation. Now in the Charity there is little of the feeling for contours, except in the Child in the lower right-hand corner. He, however, has the decision and the vivid accent that delight us in the putti of the "Madonna delle Arpie," for which reasons I infer that he must have been added at a date not much earlier than that famous altar-piece. It may be objected that Milanesi gives 1514 as the date of the first beginning of the Scalzo frescoes; but even so conservative a student as Cavalcaselle protested against this assumption, which depended on the fact that the researches of Milanesi, probably as usual incomplete, had led to the discovery of no document of earlier date regarding them. No student practised in the interpretation of documents will conclude that the contract of that year must shut out the probability that Andrea had already painted there, or that the mention of four Virtues prohibits the supposition that one of them, the Charity, was already nearly finished. Indeed it is possible that from 1509 onwards, the work was never formally abandoned; for two other drawings in the Uffizi for this series seem to me of earlier date than 1514. Of the sketch for the Decapitation of the Baptist [No. 321] I shall speak later. The other [No. 658] is a beautiful red chalk design for an allegorical female figure, Faith probably, too stiff in pose, too simple in draping, and too tight in handling to be quite as late as 1514. When finally Andrea came to paint this figure, he must have felt that the design no longer corresponded to his style, and discarded it.

Beginning, then, as early as 1509, but without leaving considerable results, starting afresh about 1512, and being again interrupted, in 1514 Andrea prepared to undertake in earnest the decoration of the Scalzo courtyard, and for ten years and more, apparently when nothing more pressing required his services, he worked upon them. These were years in which he reached his full maturity, when his art attained its utmost limits, when, in other works as well, he achieved his best and noblest. In the Preaching of the Baptist we see the artist still in his earlier epic, almost idyllic manner, although he is already condensing, and insisting upon the essential and significant, as he never did in his Annunziata frescoes. That most amazing creation, fellow to the Sixtine Sibyls, and worthier of Michelangelo than aught else whatsoever that this genius did not himself create, the figure of Justice, was painted at the same time with the last subject, as if to tell us what god was inspiring his course, and to reveal how inadequate as yet were his forces to the task of translating a whole broad narrative into the succinct language of severe dramatic art, although he could already construct single figures of all but the utmost grandeur. The influence of Michelangelo, and all that that mighty name stands for, must have been pervasive and irresistible. Perhaps Andrea would not have resisted if he could; although deep within, with the elements of temperament beyond the control of conscious will, he did, as we shall see later, resist, and to such purpose that he developed in the opposite direction, yet deliberate resistance on his part there could not have been. On the contrary, he must have submitted

with a will, with the determination to become, out of a charming and pleasant painter, an artist in the grand manner. His destiny as a painter was thus almost the exact parallel of Sebastiano del Piombo's, and hence, no doubt, the singular and manifold points of likeness in their work. And after all who shall say that both did not do well?

But to return to the Scalzo frescoes—the first of the stories in which drama gets the better of narrative, is the one where the Baptist, at the sudden command of Herod enthroned, is seized and bound. Much of the old Andrea still remains. Outside the composition, behind the scenes, as it were, lurks the executioner, and the bystanders, happily minimised to three, bespeak an almost Giorgionesque calm of indifference. But Herod's gesture is truly commanding, and Andrea did well to keep the other essential figure in the composition dominant over the two guards who are binding him. He thus avoided the obvious. The real interest remains confined to John's and Herod's action. Then, for four or five years, Andrea painted only one or two single allegorical figures at the Scalzo, and when we meet him again with his Dance of Salome we find him much advanced on his way. It is the first of three such compositions (the others being the Decapitation of the Baptist and the Feast of Herod), all executed within a period of eighteen months, which I hesitate not to say possess, for dramatic force, and the sovereign qualities of breadth and dignity, few rivals in all Italian, and indeed in all modern painting. It would be easy but idle to draw brilliant comparisons between the way Andrea has treated these episodes, and the form given them by such great masters of an earlier generation as Fra Filippo and Pollajuolo. If Andrea possesses neither the winsomeness of the one, nor the effects of inevitable line of the other, he avoids the uncouthness and provinciality of both. He attains to a breadth and serenity, to a dignity and comprehensibility that the highest classic art could possibly find fault with but could scarcely disdain. Each of these monochromes is a masterpiece of dramatic arrangement and grouping. To begin with, the number of figures is reduced, if not to those barely necessary to the development of the drama—at least to as few as a painter, with the painter's dread of a vacuum, could venture upon. The surroundings cease to suggest a reality of their own, and become the barest possible frame that will help to hold the scene together, to give it accent, and to bring it forward. There is thus no question, as in Raphael for instance, of equality between space and figures, but the former is wholly submissive to the latter, not asked to enhance but merely to contain and shelter. Then the action—who but Michelangelo himself among artists then living could have dreamt of surpassing a scene like the Decapitation? *He* would have given the commanding officer a more convincing, less pretentious air of authority; but I doubt whether he, or indeed any one else, of that or any other time, could have improved upon either the dramatic or decorative effect of the arrangement. But this rare vein soon exhausted itself, or, to put it otherwise, the task must have proved more than Herculean, and could not have been long



sustained. Hercules supported his own earth at least on his shoulders, whereas Andrea ventured to bear the burthen of a foreign, an Antique world. No wonder that a revulsion, if not a breakdown, followed ere long. From Herod's Feast Andrea turned to paint Zachariah in the Temple, still noble, still grand in intention, although the foreground figures, inevitably suggesting their too obvious purpose of merely framing in rather than forming part of the action, betray Andrea's expected lack of fusing imagination. But the Visitation makes one blush for the artist, and may well commemorate a moment of collapse, besides proving how unstable was the classical pose, how little from within, and how much from without, for a sadder instance in art of the *corruptio optimi* I have yet to find. A Venetian tribunal sternly rebuked Veronese for introducing into a sacred though festive subject, Germans. How much more, and more seriously reprehensible, was it to introduce, in a scene of classical, almost bleak severity, not, as Paolo, Germans whom he had translated into terms of his own visual imagery, but figures of Germans as visualised by a German, without the tortuous and gnarled yet supreme vitality of great Teutonic art, but with all its graceless homeliness! Happily Andrea recovered from this aberration, and in the last painting of the series, the Birth of John, he regains something, though not all, of his former breadth and grandeur.

Unfortunately, few studies remain for this one may venture to say autobiographic series of paintings, or we should have a most convincing illustration of what other drawings done in these years will presently reveal, of the effort, the endurance, the labour it must have cost Andrea thus to transmute his artistic concepts, thus to change from the easy-going narrator of *novelle* to the painter of drama almost Greek in condensation and depth. There remains, however, one tell-tale jotting. It is done with the ease and grace of a Filippino Lippi, and thrown off apparently with little thought and no effort. It is a small black chalk sketch [Uffizi, No. 321], representing, in the spirit of a rapidly, even merrily recounted *novella*, the Beheading of the Baptist. Under a pleasant knoll, the soldiers, coming in from the right and the women from the left, have happened upon the Saint. Speedily his head is cut off, and now with girlish yet impudent eagerness Salome holds out the charger. What a gulf between the sprightly liveliness of this pretty sketch and the pregnant concentration and tragic grandeur of the fresco—only less than what divides the tale of Agamemnon as told by Homer from the same tale as dramatised by Aeschylus! Yet this gulf was bridged by a Florentine, and he not of the very highest order, in the interval between sketching and executing a picture. True, we do each and all achieve in a few brief years what civilisation as a whole has taken centuries to accomplish; nevertheless this instance remains a miracle. I would fain render it more probable by assuming, what the style of the drawing well permits, that the sketch was made years before the picture, in fact before 1514, and while Andrea was still a teller of tales, and not a tragedian. Even thus, the contrast remains startling enough.

Now let us look rapidly at the other studies for these monochromes. There

is one that purports to be for the Preaching [Uffizi, No. 646]; it is however but a copy by Naldini after the finished work. For the youth seen buttoning his coat over the shoulder in the Baptism of the Multitude, there is a somewhat sprawling sketch [Uffizi, No. 657], taken evidently as a note for the action only, for the heads are different. A Baptist belonging to Mr. J. P. Heseltine, and a nude boy in the Uffizi [No. 340] are for the same composition. Only one authentic study is known to me for the executioner in the Imprisonment [Uffizi, No. 659], and that is altogether admirable both as to action and touch, done evidently from the model, and transferred to the fresco with no essential change. An earlier and much less successful rendering of the same figure (Munich, ascribed to Andrea) is represented by a large study of a youth awkwardly drawing a sword, done by Naldini, but doubtless after Andrea's original. The sketch for the man on our extreme left [Uffizi, No. 282] in the Dance of Salome is of little intrinsic and of no other interest; hasty and more spirited is the black chalk study for the erect figure in profile on the right [Louvre, No. 38]. The burly nude [Uffizi, No. 311] is but a copy by Naldini, again after an original by Andrea, which original may have been a magnificent piece of drawing, if not of style. A red chalk sketch of a slender but over-elegant youth, with arm akimbo, and long trailing mantle [Uffizi, No. 652], is what Andrea first thought of as the officer in the Decapitation. A blemish to the work this officer remains, yet he does form part of it, whereas this scented youth belongs to another world, and another order of ideas. A fine portrait head of a puzzled rather than pondering person [Uffizi, No. 292] may possibly have served for the Herod in the Feast, although, as we shall see, it more probably had another purpose. Finally, there is a drawing for the youth carrying a sack on his head in the Visitation (Cirencester, Mr. A. W. Leatham), and a capital sketch for the action of the Zachariah in the Birth of John [Louvre, No. 37].

#### IV

Meanwhile Andrea had painted not only some of his finest altar-pieces and easel pictures, but four other important mural decorations, not in monochrome this time, but with all the splendour of colour that a Florentine could give, or, indeed, fresco bear. What a chapter remains to be written on the colour required by "good fresco"; on the effect fresco-painting must have on the artist's feeling for tone as well as upon all his craftsman's habits; on the probability that all Florentine colour was more or less determined by the universal practice of fresco; and on Andrea's tone and colour as resulting from his being perhaps in the first place, and above all things, a fresco-painter! But in this book, where Andrea is not a protagonist, scarcely even a *primus inter pares*, and where fresco is not the subject in hand, this chapter shall not be intercalated.

The four frescoes referred to are the celebrated Last Supper at S. Salvi, begun

in 1519, but probably not completed for some two or three years, the no less celebrated *Madonna di Porta à Pinti*, painted about 1520, the *Tribute to Cæsar* at Poggio à Cajano, left unfinished in 1521, and the glorious *Madonna del Sacco*, dated 1525. The two more extensive of these works are so closely affiliated with one another and with the contemporary monochromes at the Scalzo, that given drawings of heads may have served for any or for all of them. Thus, at this time Andrea had a model whom he drew repeatedly in profile, and it is not easy to pronounce whether a particular sketch served for the second apostle on the left in the *Supper*, for the old man at Cæsar's feet in the *Tribute*, for the *Zachariah* in the Scalzo *Visitation*, for the same saint in the *Birth of John*, or, indeed, for the *Onofrio* in a work of still later date, the Berlin altar-piece. Again, a portrait head in the *Uffizi* [No. 292], which I have already noted as intended possibly for the *Herod* in the Scalzo *Feast*, served more probably for the third apostle on the left in the *Supper*. And if Allori really did nothing but complete the *Tribute* according to Andrea's design—which design, as we remember, belonged to Vasari—then we should be compelled to accuse Andrea of having plagiarised himself; for the two figures on the extreme right in that fresco are identical with two corresponding figures in the *Feast of Herod*.

The *Last Supper* was a frequent theme of Renaissance art, but a favourite among the painters themselves it scarcely could have been; for what could well be more difficult than to give vital unity to thirteen people seated at a table, most of them visible above the waist only? Art has to suffer such subjects, but never of herself would have chosen them. The *Last Supper*, therefore, was but once treated successfully, and that by no mere painter, no mere artist even, but by that universal genius Leonardo. With this well-nigh superhuman creation Andrea must have had acquaintance—although scarcely at first hand—and the utmost we can say for his own work is that he learned from Leonardo what he could, without slavishly imitating him, and that with Leonardo's fresco still in mind, one can look at his, even as a composition, with a certain mild pleasure. It avoids offence at least, which already is much, remains quiet, undemonstrative, unpretentious—virtues which, when we reflect upon the countless ways of going astray over this intractable subject, do from negative become positive.

In a painting like this, where little more than the busts are visible, the hands and arms become the chief, almost the sole instruments in the expression of action. Leonardo made this discovery, and Andrea failed not to take advantage of it, and all the more eagerly, no doubt, as he could seldom give to the head adequate expression of individuality, purpose, and dignity. We shall not expect of him to use arms and hands as instruments of any too high intent, but he has used them well one by one. The pleasure in this fresco is thus largely a pleasure in detail, and of detail Andrea was unrivalled master. Disregarding the mere motives which are yet so richly varied, every arm and hand is not only fulfilling its function, but is rendered with a decision of relief, with a vital accent, which I believe no other



Renaissance painter could have surpassed, if equalled. We shall not be surprised, then, if we discover, among the master's few studies for this painting, no finished one for any single figure, not even for those at the ends whom we see entire, but several for the action of the busts, for the hands and even the feet. The most important of these, and indeed in some respects Andrea's most remarkable feat as a draughtsman, is the sketch at the Uffizi [No. 664, Plate clvii.] in red chalk, of course, for the second, third, and fourth Apostles on our right, and their combined action. They are done from the nude with a veracity of vision, a definition of contour, and a fidelity to the precise accent of each movement, which illustrate perfectly what Vasari meant by the saying we reported at the beginning of this chapter, that Andrea drew for the sole purpose of discovering and noting down what nature did and looked like, so that then his sketches could, by reminding him of what he had seen, render him, when actually painting, independent of the model. With such a note as this before him, of the action of torso, head, and limbs, he could paint at his ease, conventionalising the figures to the extent that the subject demanded and his imagination permitted. Doubtless, notes of draperies, and the studies of heads also were not wanting, and a life-size profile in the Uffizi [No. 669] done from the model, nobly and grandly, may have served for one of these figures; but the little that the finished work may thus have gained over the drawing in completeness and dignity, it has lost in intimacy of revelation. The fifth of the apostles on the same side is studied in two separate sketches, in one of which he appears as a shivering nude [Uffizi, No. 663], while in the other we have his arms and hands only [Louvre, No. 49],\* these a triumph of modelling as well as of defining contours. In the Uffizi also, there is a study from the model for the action of the Christ [No. 662]. In the fresco the hands naturally remaining uncovered have lost nothing of their exquisite feeling, have even gained perhaps, but how much the figure as a whole has lost! We shall not demand of our painter what no other artist has achieved, not even Leonardo, a Christ who shall be adequate to our ideal, itself perhaps too vague and exalted for visual imagination, but in the drawing Andrea, just because he was probably not thinking of the interpretation, has, out of the simplicity of his heart, figured a Christ who recalls those charming earliest bodyings-forth of the image of the Saviour, when as yet He was rather the Bearer of Joy than the Man of Sorrows; while in the fresco He has become both sophisticated and dumb. Of further sketches for the same work, one only demands attention. It is a red chalk study [Uffizi, No. 313] for the right arm of Phillip. Almost the finest thing in the painting, it is if possible even finer in the drawing. All that I care for in an arm, all its life-enhancing power, is conveyed in this matchless note.

The fresco at Poggio à Cajano is one of the rare works for which Andrea had made an elaborate, highly finished design, which, as we know already, was afterwards in the possession of Messer Giorgio Vasari. He speaks of it twice, and so pointedly that I half suspect he had an object in so doing. His object, I

\* The same mount contains four other notes of limbs, hands, and feet for the same work.

fancy, was to suggest that whereas he was a painter in his own esteem inferior to none in his lord's employ, and whereas he was the fortunate owner of the original sketch, which sketch, moreover, was, by happy accident and most contrary to Andrea's custom, so complete that whatsoever artist of his own competence had it for guide could not go wrong in completing the fresco—that he, Messer Giorgio, therefore, and no other should be commissioned to complete it. If that had been his hope, he must have suffered keen disappointment, in the turbulent course of which the most precious, highly elaborated original sketch may have been swallowed up; for when Allori finally, in 1580, did finish the fresco, the sketch would seem not to have been accessible. At least this notion would appear the more likely, for I can more easily believe that Allori, eager to remain faithful to the forms of the master, resorted to the expedient of copying in two figures from another work, the Scalzo Feast of Herod, than that Andrea would have thus repeated himself.\*

But if the design for the whole composition has disappeared, we retain more than one sketch for single parts. Thus, the profile of a bald head [Louvre, No. 46, Plate clviii.] was more probably done for the old man kneeling at Cæsar's feet than for any other of the more or less similar profiles occurring in Andrea's work of about this time. Like most of his other drawings of this date, this study is distinguished for the accent of its contours. You feel the bone, the muscle, the pulsating vein as if passing over it with your own hand. Two heads on each side of a sheet [Louvre, No. 40, Plate clix.] are studies partly for the movement and much more for the actual form of the head on the shoulders of the man whom we see on the first step, stooping to direct the animals about to be paraded before Cæsar. And here also it is the vigorous accent of veracity, the persuasive actuality of the thing seen, that form the distinguishing note. Better still is a study at the British Museum from the nude model for the youth who in the middle distance of the fresco appears in tight-fitting jacket and hose, leaning against the parapet to look at the giraffe and other wondrous beasts which are being led forward from the background. It falls little, if at all, behind the very best sketches for the Last Supper. A miracle-working hand has, here as there, co-operated with an "innocent" but piercing eye.

This fresco, painted while Andrea was girding up his loins for efforts so unnatural to him as his heroic dramas of the Decapitation of the Baptist and the Feast of Herod, is nevertheless designed in highly festive, but unaffectedly narrative, style. To this, and this only, should we have expected the author of the Annunziata frescoes to attain. The progress shown is vast, yet altogether along the lines of his temperamental course, nay, along the lines of all mature Italian painting, as pursued by people of power and taste, when not hurled out of their orbit by the

\* I am, of course, aware of a third alternative: that, having in the course of two years abandoned every hope of finishing the Tribute, Andrea used for another work two of the figures that were to complete it. But what a hand-to-mouth character that would imply!

too close vicinity of Michelangelo. I have no doubt but that Andrea did, even at the cost of changing his skin, achieve grander things—grander, at least, in conveyed if not fully realised intention—than this Tribute; but leaving aside his own more Michelangesque successes, and putting apart Michelangelo, with his unattainable command of the nude, and Raphael with his transfiguration of earth to Elysium, where is there in Italian art a composition to surpass this? Only two artists might have painted its rival, but neither Titian nor Veronese have left aught which, fair deduction made on every hand, can be considered a greater work of art. The mere idea is one of the most genial—this basilica with its peopled grand staircase and magnificent portal, seen sideways, unrolling space away from us. Titian and Veronese have colour such as we shall not find here, but not in their frescoes.

In the self-same year perhaps in which Andrea painted this last fresco in a manner corresponding so much to what the promise of his early years led us to expect, he painted another fresco, the *Madonna di Porta à Pinti*, which, if we may judge by its various copies, the only graphic records of the original, must have been the most imposing, the most statuesque, the most Michelangesque in style of all his single groups. Thus did the pendulum sway backward and forward, for reasons beyond our, and probably beyond Andrea's, own ken. So much was this work admired, that at the siege of Florence when the suburbs were razed, friend had not the courage, nor foe the vandalism, to destroy it. Vasari adds expressly that the head was a portrait of Lucrezia del Fede.

The painting has, however, perished, but if I mistake not, we do possess at least the first design thereof. It is the swiftest, boldest, most prodigious of Andrea's drawings,\* and it was done evidently with the sole purpose of mapping out the main lines and masses of the composition [Plate clx.]. Yet, although done with this humble intention, and altogether without the model, such was the mastery which by this time Andrea had attained, that everything holds its place, and the two nude children have contours as decided as if they had been drawn from nature. The Madonna's head only is spectral and estranging, to be accounted for, perhaps, by the artist's intention from the start to replace it with his wife's, studied from life. The design as a whole underwent little change when executed, but that little scarcely for the better. It is this. In the drawing, the infant John looks out, and to the right, but soberly and quietly. Perhaps the painter felt that this figure remained too indifferent, and not sufficiently at one with the rest of the composition, wherefore in the fresco the little Baptist was turned more to the left, made to point at the Christ Child, and given one of those grimacing smiles which would seem in Andrea to bespeak what they do in the authors of the Æginetan Marbles, inadequate command of expression.†

A design so Michelangesque as this, dashed off at a moment's notice, would seem to contradict much that I have attempted to say regarding Andrea's

\* Its fortunate present owner is Mr. J. P. Heseltine.

† In the collection of Mr. J. P. Heseltine there is a sketch for this head of the infant John.



temperament and personality. We should expect that he would have come to it only after a struggle, and this certainly has all the sign-marks of being unlaboured. It would indeed be startling, if I were not morally certain that this design is due to more than the inspiration of Michelangelo, if I were not morally certain that it is but a somewhat free version of a design by Michelangelo himself. Here is the attempt at proof: At Windsor there is a magnificent study for the same subject as this, which until the other day passed unquestioned as by the great master [see Plate clviii.]. With Professor Wickhoff, I would ascribe it to Sebastiano del Piombo, but I, for my part, suppose that it is but the elaboration of a theme fully indicated by Michelangelo. Now I would not assert that Andrea, before making the sketch we have just been considering, had carefully studied the very design now at Windsor, although even that is possible; but I do say that he must have had before him either that or a similar sketch by or after Michelangelo. There are, it is true, differences between the two compositions, but they disappear before the resemblances. Andrea has changed nothing essential in the pose or action of the Madonna. There is much more difference in the children, but even there the derivation of these from those remains, to me at least, clear. To note a significant trifle, we find in both designs but one of the Virgin's feet showing. If this conclusion is tenable, then we shall understand why Andrea could dash off so sublime a composition. He must first have learned by heart a very similar one by Michelangelo himself, so that little was wanted but what he of all men could not fail to have ready, the craftsman's skill, and the great sketcher's accent.\*

The last of Andrea's frescoes is the Madonna del Sacco, painted in 1525, a work which for splendour of mere physical existence, and beauty of colour reminds one, as Andrea so frequently will remind one, of Veronese. Is it nought but mere coincidence, by the way, that the latter's Madonna in the altar-piece of the Venice Academy is of an air and carriage so like to this "of the Sack"? Be that as it may, the Madonna del Sacco, painted, let us remember, just after that miserable failure, the Scalzo Visitation, although it cannot, like the Madonna di Porta à Pinti, be said to be more or less a copy after Michelangelo, is due only in a less degree to that "divine one." "But how," it may be asked, "can a scene like this be traced back to Buonarroti?" Nothing easier. The source, the deep, broad, although unrecognised, apparently even unstudied, source of much of *quasi-genre* in Florentine and perhaps all Italian Cinquecento painting is to be found in the spandrels and lunettes of the Sixtine Ceiling, with their scenes of exquisite, brooding tenderness, domesticity, and repose. Now look carefully at the Madonna del Sacco, and what is it but a composition in a lunette varied upon some of the

\* An opposite conclusion is conceivable but I believe untenable: that Sebastiano copied Andrea. The reasons would be too many, and too boring to write down, would in fact, to be written out in full, require a book of vast dimensions treating of method of art-study in general, of the psychology of the artist, of the particular psychology of the two artists in question, of their history and chronology in detail, of Michelangelo their over-lord and his genius, and of a thousand other things. For what point does not become a vortex to the universe, requiring for full treatment infinite time! So, here and elsewhere, much must be left undemonstrated.

triangular compositions in the Ceiling? It was thence surely that directly or indirectly Andrea derived the idea of the sack, of seating the figures on the ground.

In the splendid collection of Mr. J. P. Heseltine there is a sheet upon which Andrea has made five different attempts at a Holy Family within a lunette. The space at command does of itself dictate that the figures shall not stand or sit high, yet Michelangelo was the first to perceive this fact; and Andrea follows him, although, as these sketches witness, it was at the start not easy for him to realise clearly why the lunette requires figures sitting low. In the first of these sketches he had the not over happy idea of placing the Virgin in an uneasy, half kneeling posture; and as if dreading a vacuum, he has trivially trimmed the edge of his lunette with pinned-back curtains. In the second she sits high, in some such attitude as Raphael's *Madonna dell' Agnello*. In the third she kneels, stooping, than which few postures could be less amenable to treatment in the grand manner. In the fourth she sits on the ground, but here as in two of the earlier sketches, the Child is too restless. In the fifth the Madonna sits low, giving the Child suck, and is of a grace and charm which recall Raphael or Correggio rather than Michelangelo. We have thus at last seen Andrea in the act of searching how to get beyond the instinctive simplicity of his own soul into the sublime regions of the grand style. Would that we had record of the further stages of a struggle which ended in such a victory; for a victory, and almost of the highest order, the completed fresco surely is. By placing the figures low, the artist has been able to make them as erect as the monumental style requires, while yet leaving ample space above them. And here for once Andrea has known what to do with his draperies; a glance will reveal what is owed them by the Madonna. At what length could not one write about this masterpiece—but enough! Let me but add that in the Louvre there is a charming study from the nude [No. 34, Plate clxi.] for the Joseph seated against the sack, gazing into his open book.

## V

We have now completed our study of Andrea's fresco paintings. We have seen his beginnings as a genial story-teller with a certain pleasant sense of fact and love of the object in the field of vision, and we have beheld him in riper years swept into the train of Michelangelo, endeavouring, and to a remarkable degree succeeding in his endeavour, to become a master of the dramatic, the monumental, in short, of the grand style. But, while observing all this, we have not failed to note that whereas his career as a painter—and we have now pursued this career to its highest point—grew to be more and more a conflict between his temperament and the ideals and ambitions he was compelled to embrace, his style as a draughtsman had in these stormy years undergone but little change, and that little altogether

from within, and such as must naturally come with ripening years. His drawing did thus grow less tight, and his stroke get bolder, and both bear witness to a hand that has become an abler collaborator of the eye, and to an eye more penetrating, more and more "innocent," more and more cognisant of the essential and significant. It happened that in these same years—and because these were his most vigorous years it had so to happen—while doing the utmost violence to his own temperament, and making the heroic conquest of the Michelangelesque style, Andrea reached his highest point as a draughtsman also. We are now acquainted with a great number of his drawings, and of these very years as well. What have we found them? Not, as we should perhaps have expected, grown plastic, or synthetic, or anatomical, like the drawings of other and not more successful imitators of Michelangelo; for, as countless sketches by imitators, once or still attributed to the great master himself, do witness, there is a manner of drawing only less distinctly Michelangelesque than the Michelangelesque manner of composing. But with Andrea it is quite the contrary. You could almost believe that, as if in protest against the highly idealising, magniloquent compositions which Andrea was forcing himself at this time to execute, his drawing, as if to keep up the balance, grew more and more veracious, more and more indifferent to all but the life-accent, to all but the intimate contact with detailed reality. In conscious intention the sketches of Andrea's best years betray an unsurpassed faithfulness to the thing seen—anything but that idealism and interest in the grand style which appear in his paintings. We must thus conclude that the real temperament of the man, as revealed by that most unlying of testimonies, his drawings, suffered neither diminution nor change, but grew with the growth of his temperament, while his mind, being greatly more ductile and plastic, submitted readily, as his paintings witness, to a foreign ideal.

I have preferred to base our study of Andrea's career in the first place on his frescoes, because they are the most considerable and most authentic of his works, besides being all or nearly all of known date, and thus permitting us with accuracy to pursue his career from the very beginning to nearly the end. Moreover, Florentine painters were, above all things, fresco-painters, and it is in fresco, as a rule, that they are most themselves. So we have, I think, done well to base our acquaintance with, and estimate of Andrea's artistic personality on his mural paintings. We can now give the completion to the structure, and the finishing touches, by turning back to the beginning and pursuing to the end our examination of his various altar-pieces and panel pictures.

Vasari mentions as an early work by Andrea, a smallish picture painted for the Company of St. Mary of the Snow, representing the Madonna between St. Ambrose and the Baptist. This panel can no longer be traced, but I suspect that we have a study for the Baptist in a charming black chalk figure [Uffizi, No. 325] of a smiling, half-clothed youth, pointing to the right, and clearly meant for a St. John, and even more clearly belonging to Andrea's earlier



years, to about 1511, let us say. Of the same date would, I judge, be a sketch for a Resurrection [Uffizi, No. 630], wherein this theme is treated freshly and daintily, and not without dignity. Here again the artist reminds one of contemporary Venetians—if not of Giorgione himself, then of Catena in such a work for instance as the S. Cristina altar-piece at Venice. The study for the angel Gabriel [Uffizi, No. 273] in the Pitti Annunciation [No. 124] is not a conspicuously fine drawing, but is interesting. Done from the model, it evidently records all that Andrea saw, and only what he saw, but not yet with the vitalising touch of later years. Thus, the wings are indicated slightly; the throat is more vigorously muscular than beautiful, and the draperies at once more prettily detailed and less functional than art requires. In the painting we see that the artist knew what to take and what to leave of his sketch.

There is in the Uffizi a sheet [No. 307] with two studies done obviously after a model. One is of a full-length youth, standing as awkwardly as only persons posing for an artist will stand, in profile to left. His left hand holds something, and what his right is doing would remain a riddle, were it not that the other sketch which repeats the upper part of the same figure seen more from the back and with a mantle swung from the right shoulder and across the hips, shows that he is holding a drapery. Nothing, I repeat, could be more merely "*atelier*" than these two drawings, and, looking at them without foreknowledge, little would one suspect that they were done in preparation for what was perhaps Andrea's most poetical work. This work was that famous Dead Christ mourned over by three Angels which, before it was sent to France and there lost, was engraved by Agostino Veneziano. The painter's reported dissatisfaction with the engraving, dated, by-the-by, 1516, was justified, yet it suffices to establish that the picture, as a design at least, must have been of a beauty, and depth of feeling, and poetry most unexpected in Andrea. At the foot of Calvary an angel, with a sweep of mighty wings that cut into the sky-line, supports against his knee the limp body of the dead Saviour. On the left kneels a pitying child angel, on the right, the one blemish in this poesy, stands in profile the figure for which the two studies we have just examined were made, a robust angel with flowing curls, holding in his right hand the nails of the cross, and with his left his—mantle. On the sky-line, high up in the picture, in the middle of the space framed in by the mighty wings, we descry the foot of the cross and the ladder. The entire conception of the subject is not Florentine, nor could Andrea have invented it. Its ultimate origin must have been Venice, and the circle of the Bellini, but by what stages did it reach Andrea's brain? Perhaps through Signorelli's sublime picture in S. Niccolò at Cortona.

We shall appreciate more readily what a leap Andrea here made out of his usual course, if at this point we take a glance at his other treatments of the "Pietà"; and while doing this, we shall of course not lose the occasion to examine the extant sketches related to them. Near the beginning of this chapter I ventured to criticise the most famous of these pictures, the one now at

the Pitti [No. 58], for inadequacy of conception, for poverty of composition, and for a signal lack of values of movement and action. And as this Pitti panel is in idea and arrangement typical, so are its faults. We find typical qualities as well as faults in a work now lost, if ever executed, but perpetuated in an excellent copy by Naldini [Louvre, No. 35], perhaps after the original drawing,\* which drawing I infer by the shape of the Baptist's hand to have been done as early as 1513 or so. It happens to be not only the earliest of the three compositions we shall discuss, but also the most satisfactory. Here, if the dead Christ is not relaxed as he should be in infinite rest, we do at least feel something of repose in the way his head and shoulders lie against His mother's lap, and something of genuine tenderness in her hand supporting His head, and in her look; and the two erect figures, although they are of course not right as arrangement, are yet neither so out of place nor so magniloquently dumb as in the Pitti picture. Some two or three years later, Andrea painted the rectangular panel of the exquisite cool tone of an early Della Robbia which is now at Vienna [No. 39]. The space at command has dictated a composition more successful than that of either the one copied in the Louvre sketch or the painting in the Pitti. The dead Christ lies on a parapet, not however relaxed, but in the somewhat rigid pose that a model might have taken, nor properly supported, with but the do-nothing hand of an angel resting on His shoulder. His mother with clasped hands rises from the waist up above Him, while the youthful Baptist† clutches *her* drapery. Not only is the Christ as unrelaxed and unsupported as a figure will be when drawn by a man who cannot get away from his model, but He shows the ridges of the back, as if the artist's real interest were solely to get clearly limiting outlines, as if contour meant much more to him than action. So in the last and most famous of Andrea's "Pietàs," the one to which we have now referred several times, painted in 1524 and now in the Pitti, we cannot but observe beside the signal faults of composition already mentioned early in this chapter—due to a calm unconsciousness of the grand opportunities for action afforded by the theme, and an insensitiveness to its poetical possibilities—how the painter has sacrificed the whole picture, all genuine poetry, and all life-communicating action to the contours of the dead Christ. How unlike all this to the lost "Pietà" engraved by Agostino Veneziano!

As the faults of the Pitti picture are far from being faults of detail, as Andrea was frequently a bungling artist, but, at this time at least, everything but a bungling draughtsman, and as a sketch is by definition never incomplete, seeing that the intelligent spectator always supplies it out of his own imagination with every necessary aid and accompaniment, it follows that studies from the model for any part of this composition should be masterpieces.‡ Nor is our

\* Uffizi No. 635 is a later and characterless copy of the same original.

† For the head of this figure there is a sketch in the British Museum [No. 136].

‡ In the Uffizi there is a copy [No. 642], there passing as an original after a sketch by Andrea, for the entire composition of this picture. In this sketch the arrangement is so superior, and the theme so much better comprehended

expectation disappointed. The red chalk sketch for the dead Christ [Louvre, No. 50] was evidently done from nature, for which reasons the extremities are almost neglected, the chief object being to get the decisive, imperative contour; and Andrea got it of course with the ring and accent that we know. The only other studies for this work with which I am acquainted are an effaced one for the head of the Catherine [Uffizi, No. 653], and a magisterially powerful one for the head of the Magdalen [Uffizi, No. 644].

And in connection with these two heads, we shall do well, at this point, to consider drawings of a few other female heads, not to be attached to any given work, unless we except the one obvious sketch for a portrait, but done as studies from the model. Vasari tells us who this model was: it was Andrea's wife; and he adds that the artist drew and painted her so repeatedly and constantly that, through the hold her face had got upon what we nowadays should call his habits of visualising and habits of hand, Andrea finally could limn no woman's head but what resembled his wife's. Nor is this case isolated in the annals of art—witness Rubens. Indeed the whole general question of the very possibility of portraiture is one of the most delicate and difficult that the subtle student can encounter, and yet it must be met and settled before he shall pronounce in any given instance upon the identification of the person represented. With words of such brevity and sibylline sound for an introduction, let us look at the few drawings of this series.

In the Louvre there is a small head [No. 51 (1)] portraying a girl of eighteen or nineteen, of a vivacity and waywardness and fascination especially designed by Providence to turn the head, and addle the brain, and enthrall the heart of a man. If this was Lucretia del Fede, a question I cannot here seriously enter upon, Andrea's passion and uxoriousness need no further explanation. A companion head in the Louvre [No. 51 (2)] seems scarcely after the same woman, but may have been after the model that later posed for the Magdalen in the Pitti "Pietà"; and a bust in red chalk at the Ecole des Beaux Arts, very quietly done with a beautiful simplicity and fulness of vision, would seem to be the same person, but done at a date more than at mid-interval between these two sketches. The seductive face of the first of these sketches reappears transformed from girl to matron in that most genial of Florentine portraits, the one of a Lady with a Petrarch open in her hands, looking as if she embraced the singer of love and ourselves in one sympathising, warming smile [Uffizi, No. 188]. The nose has become a trifle less saucy, the mouth less alluring, but otherwise these characteristic features remain unchanged. Are these really aspects of Lucretia, and is it possible that the other heads are further, more prosaic phases of the same enchantress? At Berlin there is a bust [No. 240] of a woman of alert look, and of the proud carriage that Andrea, while working upon the Scalzo frescoes, so readily gave his

that one cannot understand why Andrea discarded it. In the Malcolm Collection [No. 109] there is a copy of still another sketch for the same work.



figures. This same face constantly occurs in the Master's maturer paintings, and it must be of Lucretia, but it is scarcely she who sat for the Louvre drawing or the Uffizi painting. It is, however, beyond serious question the person represented in one of the artist's most interesting sketches, a red chalk drawing [Uffizi, No. 647, Plate clxii.], wherein we see studied from life a woman with knees crossed sitting in a chair, with her arms resting on its arms, holding with both her hands a book on her lap. The look is as of a person somewhat tired, and the modelling of the face gives a most curious effect, not of vagueness in the object, nor of dim vision in the artist, but of atmospheric impediment—an effect not unlike those for different reasons obtained nowadays by Carrière and Monet and others—as if the light upon it were shifting and inconstant, but for that reason all the more palpably present. Then, how this is composed, how the woman sits, what action of arms and hands—in a word what a masterpiece, and what a loss that this was never painted, or, if painted, that it has disappeared! Noteworthy is also the same head, still older perhaps, looking down with the chin drawn in [Albertina]. And while dwelling upon Andrea's sketches for portraits, one should not overlook the blinking face of a slobbering old man [Louvre, No. 78], on whose dew-lapped cheeks a wart with its every individual hair finds a place of honour.

And now let us make a fresh start, first turning back to the period when Andrea was painting the "Pietà" engraved by Agostino Veneziano. A certain peculiarity in the drawing of the hands, more easily noted than described, connects with the studies for this work a sheet in the British Museum [Plate clxiii.] covered on both sides with sketches of children in various attitudes. Two of them are much more elaborated than the rest and are studied for the head and shoulders only. These are of singular excellence. Most of them must clearly have been intended for an Infant John, and some for the Christ Child. We are led to expect some such composition as Franciabigio's Madonna in the Lichtenstein Collection at Vienna, wherein we see the Child fluttering a scroll while the infant Baptist points to Him, and for pictures of this sort some of these sketches may have served. Andrea doubtless had several such panels on the stocks at a time. But the two more elaborated busts of a child looking smilingly over his shoulder, and some of the others probably as well, were certainly made for the Baptist in the noble Madonna with Four Children at Hertford House [No. 9].\*

At the same time, or even a little earlier, to judge by the likeness of the Virgin to the Scalzo Justice, probably no later than 1515, Andrea must have done the Madonna with St. Elizabeth and St. Catherine and the two Infants, a work in sad condition but of beautiful design, now at St. Petersburg [No. 24]. In the British Museum there is a large red chalk drawing which, were it an original, would have to

\* In Lord Pembroke's Collection there is a sketch in red chalk after a work of this date, the Madonna with Margaret, Catherine, and the Infant Baptist, now at Dresden [No. 76]. The sketch used to be attributed to Correggio, but the editor of the publication would place it somewhere close to Lotto. (Reproduced as Plate 48 of Messrs. P. & D. Colnaghi's publication of the Pembroke Drawings, edited by Professor S. A. Strong.)

be regarded as a study for the St. Catherine in this picture; but unfortunately the sketch, close as it is to Andrea, lacks his quality, and has instead a certain unwonted sweetness which, in connection with other things, tempts me to believe that it is a copy by Puligo after the figure in the painting.

The "Madonna delle Arpie" deserves all its renown. A work of the very first order it certainly is not, but as a composition it has more than the grandeur and much of the quiet impressiveness of Titian's earlier altar-pieces. True, the arrangement, if much more subtle than in the Venetian, is not quite so natural, and the pose of the Madonna is calculated to exaggerate rather than to take away from the effect of a statue on a pedestal; but the whole remains of a noble dignity and solemn gravity, and if the colour lacks the glamour that even poorer followers of Giorgione could command, the treatment of light and shade is of an adequacy that perhaps no Italian painter then working could quite equal. And here be it by the way observed that this super-eminent master of chiaroscuro in painting so instinctively felt the difference between painting and drawing as arts, that among his extant sketches you shall find scarcely one which is not in essence a line-drawing. Four authentic studies are known for this masterpiece. One in the Uffizi [No. 628] is for the Madonna's hand holding the book, and obviously from the model. The other three are for the Francis. In the Uffizi again [No. 333] are excellent separate sketches for the lower part of his drapery and for his head, both considerably varied in the painting. The study at Düsseldorf for the whole figure comes much nearer to the one finally executed.\* The Louvre has a sketch, done, like all the others for this altar-piece, directly from the model, for the head of Francis, very good, but in expression and even type singularly like a Lo Spagna.

If there be a work in which Andrea is faultless—*senza errori*—it is the Charity of the Louvre. It marks the moment when he had reached his own natural maturity, carried onwards, it is true, upon the rising tide of the "grand manner" and Michelangesque style, but as yet neither swept, as somewhat later, off his own feet, nor still less, overwhelmed. And this Charity is much more than merely faultless. She is simply, persuasively, convincingly grand with almost a Greek naturalness and tranquillity—a Demeter as yet unbereft of Persephone. Then such beauty of detail! What finer, for instance, than the action of the child at her breast! It is most regrettable that the many original studies which Andrea surely must have made for this masterpiece have been reduced to one, and that one, of the least interesting head in the work, the head of the other waking child [Louvre, No. 52].

Between his return from France and the completion in 1526 of the monochromes at the Scalzo, fresco-painting seems to have been Andrea's chief occupation; for, beside the two panels now in the Pitti with the Story of Joseph,

\* I take great pleasure in referring the reader to an article on this drawing by Herr Friedrich Schaarschmidt ("Zeitschrift," June 1900). It is a model of what a paper on a single drawing should be.

which may belong to the earlier part of this period, and the famous "Pietà," also in the Pitti, as well as one or two of the portraits, I should be at a loss to name a single extant panel of any sort painted with his own hand in these years. A number of sacred subjects doubtless left his shop at this time and now adorn the various collections of Europe, but I cannot descry the master's touch in them, although it is clear that he is responsible for their design.\*

Thus, a rather famous picture of about the period we have now reached, 1518 namely, is an Annunciation at the Pitti [No. 97] which, if it really be the work whereof Vasari speaks as painted early in his career by Andrea for S. Godenzo, must be repainted beyond recognition. But I entertain the liveliest doubts whether he actually executed the picture at all, although it is clear that he designed it, and indeed there exists a sketch for the Announcing Angel [Uffizi, No. 627]. But this sketch is done in Andrea's middle manner, somewhat after rather than before 1517, and thus proves that the picture could not have been an early work.

But after 1526 we note the beginning of a certain mental if not manual weariness in his compositions. They have neither the freshness of his early, quasi-Giorgionesque manner, nor yet the magnificence and dramatic force of his middle years, and even in the pictures painted with his own hand, as in the two Assumptions in the Pitti, a certain dulness makes itself felt; and more and more was the execution of entire works, such as of the Poppi altar-piece now in the same collection [No. 123], or the single panels once at S. Agnese and now in the Cathedral of Pisa, turned over to pupils. Yet is no diminution or failing perceptible in his quality as a draughtsman. Extant studies for his least satisfactory last paintings are no whit inferior in accent, or touch, or even vision to those of his most triumphant moments, as we shall presently see while proceeding with the study of the sketches by Andrea for pictures painted by himself or his pupils in these last years of his life.

We can scarcely do better than group these works about the three of known date, that is to say, the Berlin altar-piece, the Four Saints of the Florence Academy, and the two Putti originally on the same altar with them at Vallombrosa, all of which were painted in 1528, and the Poppi Madonna in Glory with Four Saints [Pitti, No. 123], left, as we know, unfinished at Andrea's death. The first is still an admirable composition with the figures grouped clearly and naturally, and not lacking in dignity; but it is not free from a certain perfunctoriness which makes itself felt through the fact, for example, that the Madonna and the St. Juliana are almost repetitions of one another. The Vallombrosa work is good in detail, but except as detail is scarcely a masterpiece. The Poppi picture is fine enough as design, but I question whether the artist ever worked on it with his own hands.

\* A small drawing in the Louvre, elaborately finished with bistre wash and white, is a faithful copy after a lost work, contemporary with the later Scalzo frescoes, which lost work was a most admirable composition representing the Descent of the Holy Spirit [photo. Braun, No. 137].



The two Assumptions now in the Pitti, each with its own qualities of excellence as painting, but both products of a singularly unpoetical and unimaginative mood; would seem to have been done before 1528. The Pisan panels, of which the St. Agnes is almost identical with the Madonna in the Poppi altar-piece, must be from the very end of Andrea's career, and like that picture they were not executed by Andrea although they were certainly designed by him. Somewhat earlier again than this final moment must be the date of the Madrid altar-piece [No. 385], by far the most inspired of Andrea's later efforts, and the Pitti Madonna in Glory with six Saints [No. 307], another of the undertakings which the artist allowed his pupils to paint for him.

But indifferent as most of the pictures just enumerated will leave us, the studies made by Andrea in preparation for them are, as I have already said, as good as his best, and, as has been all along our plan, we shall now glance at the more important of them in connection with the paintings for which they served.

For the more admirable of the Assumptions, the one with the delightful putti who support tablets [Pitti, No. 225], there are in the Uffizi several studies from nature, all interesting or excellent, for the figure of her Madonna. Two [Nos. 302, 303] are from the male nude for the entire action of her figure, and are done with Andrea's clearest accent. At least one of several heads is a noteworthy study for her upturned face [No. 278], while two others [Nos. 323 and 327] are for the draperies over her knees. For the less interesting Assumption [Pitti, No. 191] I have discovered but one sketch, that, however, a very beautiful one for the cherub with clasped hands on the left [Louvre, No. 48]. No less than five sketches, four of them of the highest order as drawing, are known to me for the Madrid picture. For the Joseph there is in the Louvre [No. 41], a most noble head, of living contour and delicate structure the great qualities of which the corresponding head in the painting, at least to judge of it in its present condition, has failed to attain. The other four are in the Uffizi, all from the model. One is for the whole figure of the Child [No. 291], another [No. 632] is for His head, and is again superior to that in the picture, while another is for the entire action of the angel [No. 318], and a fourth [No. 324] is for the detailed movement of the same figure, beautifully noted.

More interesting still are the extant studies for the Berlin altar-piece. A high achievement even for Andrea is the red chalk sketch at the British Museum, containing an unsurpassable study from the nude model for the S. Onofrio, with another, less attentively done and from the draped figure, for the St. John Gualbert. Here if anywhere, we can watch Andrea's processes, and note his unmeasured superiority as a draughtsman. And the other studies for the same work are scarcely inferior to this first. A profile of an elderly man, which occurs not infrequently in Andrea's paintings, is most probably for the Onofrio [Uffizi, No. 289]. An even abler rendering from life is that for the head of St. Mark [Uffizi, No. 648] while finer still is the study in the Louvre

[No. 42, Plate clxiv.] for the head of the St. Catherine. Certainly done from life, this head has a wearied, pitying look, transcribed by the artist from the perhaps momentary mood of the sitter. Who was she? Bearing in mind the difficulty of every attempt at identification in portraiture, I nevertheless venture to suggest that she was the donor's wife. In the painting, it will be observed, she and the St. Celsus look across at one another; and I am at a loss to explain this singularity unless it be that in Celsus is portrayed the donor and in Catherine his wife.

In the same year as the Berlin work, Andrea painted for Vallombrosa, three panels, originally separate, which are now in the Florence Academy, the two taller panels with two Saints in each joined together. There is a most delightful study for the Michael [Uffizi, No. 288], free, bold, and rapid, dashed down while the model was striking the attitude. Would that Andrea, whose forces as a draughtsman were still on the increase while his power as a painter was already on the wane, had succeeded in transferring this brilliant figure to the panel without spoiling it! A head for the St. Bernard is less interesting [Uffizi, No. 640], but of the very finest character, again, is the study for the two Putti [Uffizi, No. 297]. And for Andrea's last undertaking, the Poppi altar-piece, there are in the Uffizi [No. 293] more than faultless studies for the hands of the S. Fedele and the St. John Gualbert; but these hands might almost have served for other works of these last years, and, indeed, the repetition of attitudes, if not of whole figures, is at this period frequent enough to suggest that the artist no longer would or could make the effort to invent afresh, but was content to repeat and piece together. Thus, to take but one example, in the St. John of the Pisa panels, the upper part differs but little from the Baptist in the Four Saints of the Florence Academy, while the lower part is a mere variation on the S. Onofrio in the Berlin altar-piece. Yet pieced together as is this painting, there is, as drawing, little that can be ranked much higher than the study for the hands and legs of the same figure [Uffizi, No. 320]. Finally, we must note several sketches for the three traitor captains whom, in 1529, Andrea was commissioned to paint, hanging, as was the ancient Florentine custom, by the leg. All these studies are in the Uffizi. One of them [No. 6432] was evidently done from the life, and is of a figure in costume rushing forward in an attitude which, if reversed, would give something of the action of a figure hanging by the leg—a sketch which thus bears witness to the artist's lack of visual imagination. The others are of nudes and of the same figures clothed, all of great merit as drawing.

---

We have now traced Andrea's career to the end. We have tried to discover what he was by temperament, what he endeavoured to make of himself, how well he succeeded when floating with the natural current of his mind, how splendidly, again, when striving hard against it. But whatever ups and downs he had as an

artist, and even as a painter, as a draughtsman he was ever increasing, ever rising, with never a sign of a step backward. Even as a draughtsman, however, we shall not, we have already concluded, rank him with Pollajuolo and Leonardo and Michelangelo, for he lacked the constructive and transfiguring mind of these inspired men; but he could render the thing seen with a veracity, a persuasiveness, and a penetrating vitality that they scarcely dreamt of. That must be Andrea's ultimate title to fame.

## VI

Vasari immortalises the mere names of a number of Andrea's pupils, but too little of them is known to allow us to ascribe to this or that one of them any of the drawings still passing as the master's, although obviously not his. They are neither numerous nor noteworthy, the most conspicuous among them being the silly red chalk series of landscape sketches at the Uffizi [Nos. 10, 12, 13, 14, 15-19, 21, 22-27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32-42 of Cat. V., and 1313-1318, 1355-1360 of Cat. I.], two of which are dated 1527, and all of which are by the same hand.\* We need not linger over these or their peers, but can pass on to consider first Andrea's two intimate companions, Franciabigio and Puligo, and then that feeble follower of all and sundry, but chiefly of Franciabigio and Andrea, Bacchiacca.

It is a fact of not infrequent occurrence that a given mediocre artist is a good, at times even an excellent, painter of portraits. Hence he acquires a name that, spreading beyond the consideration he merits as a portraitist, redounds altogether too favourably to the credit of his other works. Now Franciabigio was such a portraitist. He fabricated likenesses of more than respectable mediocrity, even if we do not go the length of ascribing to him such a remarkable creation as the bust of a pensive youth in the Louvre [No. 1644]. As an artist he had his ups and downs, chiefly downs, although one of his works, the "Madonna del Pozzo" has for generations enjoyed the glory of passing for Raphael's and hanging "on the line" in the Tribune of the Uffizi. In that composition he is, however, at his best. What he could sink to, the Calza Last Supper reveals, or even the more accessible Scalzo frescoes.

Of such a craftsman, most successful in his portraits, we should expect no especial qualities of drawing, but, at the utmost, a certain fidelity to fact. We are not surprised, therefore, to find that the only drawings in which Franciabigio is a tolerable draughtsman are one or two for portraits. In the Louvre [No. 212, Plate clxv.] there is a characteristic transcript from life of a youngish man, low-necked and with a broad-brimmed hat turned back high over the

\* In his pen-drawings this artist, whoever he was, imitated Fra Bartolommeo even more than Andrea, and attained to a higher level than in red chalk. The most interesting specimens are: Albertina S.R. 322, 323, and 324 [photo. Braun, Vienna 197, 198, 199], ascribed to Raphael; Uffizi 45<sup>r</sup>, 46<sup>r</sup>, 47<sup>r</sup>, 48<sup>r</sup>, and 49<sup>r</sup>; attributed to Bartolommeo; and Stockholm 69 76.



forehead. It is not badly done, nor even badly conceived, but remains dull and almost lifeless. It bears strong witness, however, to Pier di Cosimo's influence upon its author. A very much smaller sketch at Lille [No. 429] is no whit better as drawing, but more fortunate in the person represented.\*

Of Franciabigio's other drawings, by far the best and most interesting is again at the Louvre. It is a highly finished sketch in bistre, done with the painstaking method of a man who has no great talent and little feeling for the distinction between painting and drawing. It represents in an elaborate arched frame resting on Doric half-columns the Madonna enthroned on a round pedestal consisting of two steps. On either side a female saint is seen. The Child stands between His mother's knees, in a way reminiscent of Michelangelo's group at Bruges. The types are those of the S. Giobbe altar-piece now in the Uffizi [No. 1264]. The picture for which this was designed has disappeared or perished, and, apparently, unrecorded.

A design for another lost picture is so much in the manner of Andrea that I am scarcely surprised to find it still passing unquestioned as that master's. It is a sketch for a tondo [Uffizi, No. 638, Plate clxvi.], in which we see the Madonna seated on the ground looking at Joseph who rests beside her, while the Christ Child plays with the Infant John. Made under the overwhelming influence of Andrea, the Joseph and the Infant Baptist are figures which, but for poor drawing, might have been sketched by that artist in his earliest middle years. Franciabigio's hand betrays itself notwithstanding, both in the spirit of the whole and in a certain tendency to curvilinear action, in the movement of the arms, in the folds of the draperies, and in the shape of the hands. The two hands, for example, of the Madonna and Child that touch might, if transposed, be cut out from a Madonna by Franciabigio in the Corsini Gallery at Rome, there, it is true, ascribed to Bugiardini.

Passing over one or two other sketches which will be sufficiently noted in the Catalogue, we come to a study in the Albertina, there until recently ascribed to Raphael, and now to that master's school, but which a number of students have for the last ten years or more been ascribing to Franciabigio. It can arouse no wonder that this sketch passes as Raphael's, for not only is it thoroughly Raphaellesque in shading, but at first glance it would seem done for the group round Pythagoras in the School of Athens. On the other hand there can be little doubt that its real author is Franciabigio. His, clearly, are the types and his only can be the hand of the model enclosing the staff. But the result allows one to appreciate Vasari's remark about the despair that overcame Franciabigio at the sight of certain paintings by Raphael.

\* Attributed to Raphael, and first correctly ascribed by Morelli.

## VII

Our tale of Puligo is brief and soon told. That he had a certain sense of beauty and a certain charm we can see with our own eyes; that he was gifted with facility we can believe; that, as Vasari further tells us, art did not interest him so much as life, is borne out by the fact that his paintings, although rare, are frequently copies after Andrea. Evidently Puligo would not be bothered about composition; and as the mere brush-work came easy, copying just suited him. Yet he enjoyed a certain reputation in a form of art where one perforce must do more than copy: he was said to be a good portrait-painter. I think I can cite at least one portrait by him. Of course he had to submit to the terrible law that from him who hath little even that little shall be taken away. And this work, after having like many another by the same master passed for generations as Andrea's, was by Cavalcaselle tentatively attributed to Bacchiacca, and is now exhibited in the Hermitage [No. 25] as Pontormo's. It represents a young woman of very pleasing countenance and elegant dress, seated, with her hand resting on a small tower. This toy does not seem well related to the hand, and may have been added somewhat later, by the same simpleton who thought that by not over appropriately crowning the fashionable head-dress with a halo he would change this flower of worldliness into a saint, and, adding the tower as an emblem, into a St. Barbara.

I have never seen this picture, and I hear it is in very bad condition, but Braun's excellent photograph suffices to tell me that it is by Puligo. To one who knows this painter, argument will not be necessary; others are not to be argued with. To prepare their minds, however, let me urge them to consider the eyes, and the mouth, and the ringlets with corresponding features in such a work by Puligo as the Madonna with the profile of a boy saint belonging to Miss Hertz,\* and to compare the way the folds are treated with the folds over the arm in the Magdalen of the Borghese Collection.

But considerations of style alone, which those who know not what style is find so unfruitful or unsafe, shall not in this case remain unsupported. Reading over again Vasari's life of Puligo I was struck by the following passage: "He portrayed also in a picture Barbara the Florentine, at that time famous as a beautiful courtesan beloved of many for her charming ways, and still more for her excellent music and divine singing."† Surely the portrait before us is the one Messer Giorgio was at the pains to describe, and, in a more pious age when the effigies of ladies renowned for loveliness could be tolerated only when veiled over with the emblems of holiness, it must have been the clear recollection that this had been Barbara which led to the awkward addition of the emblem belonging to the saint of that name. There is record even of this attempted

\* Photo. Anderson, 5268.

† Vol. iv. p. 465.

transformation. Borghini, in his "Riposo" published in 1585 [p. 396], adds to Vasari's description of this picture the following: "It now belongs to Giovanbattista Dati who, to satisfy his wife who kept this picture in her chamber, caused the partition of music which Barbara held in her hand to be erased, and had painted instead the symbol of St. Lucy." This last word must of course be a misprint. Why Lucy? Or, if that be really what Borghini wrote, then later still, the identity of the sitter not having been forgotten, it was changed further into Barbara.

Although Puligo could thus paint a portrait that is still a source of pleasure, and although his other paintings are not without a certain charm, neither his extant works nor the reputation he had among his contemporaries would lead us to expect much of him as a draughtsman. If, however, our expectations are not too high, we shall not fail to find a certain touch of quality in his drawings. They also are very rare, and of these few among the best are a copy after Andrea and another so inspired by this artist that it passes unquestioned as his. The first, in the British Museum, is a bust in red chalk of a very attractive, youngish woman, kindly and sweet, who looks at us with a genial smile. She leans forward as if her elbows were resting on a parapet. On the left she is incomplete in a way that we should be puzzled to account for if we did not know that the original from which this is copied does at this point disappear behind another figure. This original is the St. Catherine in the Holy Family at the Hermitage [No. 24]. Puligo could not help sweetening the face, but thereby he betrays himself. The folds also are characteristic of him. The second, in the Louvre [No. 32], is a large study for an Evangelist, and passes as the sketch for that Saint in Andrea's "Madonna delle Arpie." But an intelligent, if also properly instructed glance, will at once absolve Andrea of this charge. He was never thus flimsy and fluffy. These mere clothes, these folds, these spectral eyes and this ghost-like vagueness of feature are Puligo's, and none but Puligo's. Of course he had Andrea's figure in mind.

More obviously and indisputably Puligo's is another sketch in the Louvre representing the Madonna enthroned between St. James and St. Peter, doubtless the design for some altar-piece, unrecorded and perhaps lost. Here the types bear sufficient witness to the authorship. There is little to be said for such a drawing except that, with all its faults, it is yet more of a real work of art than any of those triumphs of mere calligraphy achieved by a Bandinelli or a Carracci. But as actual draughtsmanship the most characteristic of all Puligo's extant sketches is one in the Uffizi for a Judgment of Solomon [No. 468, Plate clxvii.]. The story is recounted with few figures, whether conceived as nude or as partly draped who shall say? So vague is the intention of the artist. Yet flimsy as is this sketch, it is not the drawing of a fool, and as a composition it is of no little merit. Puligo's most charming drawing is still to be mentioned. It is a very pretty design for a Nativity in the collection of Lord Pembroke.



## VIII

Bacchiacca was a small master who spent his life copying all his Florentine contemporaries, besides taking what suited him out of Lucas van Leyden's engravings. He was what with no great exaggeration might be called a "scissors-and-paste" artist, in other words, a compiler. Yet he compiled not unintelligently, and although you will never discover in his pictures a figure positively his own, you will seldom find one positively out of place. He knew how to prepare out of the crumbs of his beggar's scrip a feast modest enough yet palatable, and even pleasant. Perugino seems to have been his first master, then Granacci must have employed him. Franciabigio and even Puligo, and, of course, Andrea del Sarto did not escape his bedesman's visits. Another Andrea, a pupil of Michelangelo, concerning whom I found something to say in the last chapter, was also his willing or unwilling benefactor. This Andrea's drawings seem to have fallen into the hands of Bacchiacca, who used them unblushingly in his masterpiece, the Moses Striking the Rock, of the Giovanelli Collection. A more than adequate and more than duly appreciative account of him will be found in Morelli, who, as Bacchiacca's discoverer, was perhaps inclined to over-estimate the value of his discovery. Bacchiacca was, for instance, not the author of the charming bust of a boy attributed in the Louvre to Raphael, a work in which I am inclined to recognise the hand of Sogliani; nor was he capable of making such a design as the fine red chalk one of a lady, ascribed in the Uffizi to Leonardo, but certainly by Pontormo; nor did he draw the various Michelangesque heads Morelli dowered him with, these being by the Andrea recently mentioned; nor still less was it in his feeble power to create such superb grotesques as those by Michelangelo himself on a sheet at Lille. In truth, the student runs not only the risk of somewhat over-enlarging the artistic personality of a petty master, but the far more serious one of magnifying his importance as an artist. An eclectic, ever varying, and yet with a firm foundation of uniformity, affords the easiest and most flattering of tasks to the connoisseur. You can recognise this sort of eclectic by mannerisms alone, and these are, to the patient worker, almost contemptibly easy to perceive and acquire, while the vexatious and compassless considerations of quality need never enter or disturb his mind. The connoisseur, who is generally an empiric rather than an introspective psychologist, is only too apt to identify the pleasure of mere recognition with the altogether higher one of purely artistic perception, and thus seldom becomes aware that what delights him is not his pet's achievement, but his own cleverness in recognising it.

Yet Bacchiacca is not wholly contemptible even from an artistic standpoint. His highest merit was perhaps a pretty vein of narrative, a certain simple charm of composition, and a pleasant way of putting odds and ends together. We shall, of course, expect no great things of his drawings. They are nevertheless not

wholly bad, and witness at least to his serious endeavour to do the best he could. Of the few known to me, the earliest perhaps is a sketch for an embroidery or for some other task of minor decoration of the kind which all his life absorbed his feeble but pretty talent. The sketch in question is for a design in a tondo representing a boy warrior straddling a heavy and peaceable horse and holding his right hand with a sword in it, over a flame [Plate clxviii.]. The surrounding landscape is distinctly in the manner of Andrea del Sarto, but the rest, from the candelabrum topped by the flame to the horse and rider, are so Peruginesque that until recently this leaf passed as Pietro's. And sure enough! Bacchiacca could scarcely have pulled this pleasant thing out of his own uninventive brain. Doubtless, some St. Martin by Perugino served him as the model for this Mucius Scaevola.

Four sprawling brats in the library of Christ Church, Oxford, inspired by those in Andrea's Louvre Charity must have been done somewhat later. One of them is exactly like, and actually may have served for, the Infant John in Bacchiacca's Madonna at Wiesbaden [No. 114], there ascribed to Pierino del Vaga. With one exception, the only other sketches I know by this master were all made in preparation for the two long panels in the National Gallery and their companions in the Borghese Gallery, recounting the Story of Joseph and his Brethren in Egypt, which panels were probably painted in or about 1523, seeing that some of the figures recur in a Legendary Subject of that date at Dresden [No. 80]. The first in the order of the narrative is No. 1219 of the National Gallery which recounts the return of the Brethren with their gifts and the little Benjamin, their reception by Joseph, and then, apparently, their departure. It is for the last episode of this panel that, if memory do not fail me, there is a cartoon in black and white chalk at Christ Church, Oxford, and in the Albertina there is a sketch in red chalk for the guard under the portico leaning on his staff. The latter drawing and a companion figure also in the Albertina are both niggling and painstaking affairs, betraying in the stroke the influence of Granacci. This companion drawing was a study for the last of the figures on our left in the episode of the other National Gallery panel [No. 1218], wherein we see Judah and his Brethren imploring Joseph to show compassion to the little Benjamin. In the Uffizi [No. 350] may be seen the most interesting because the least finished, and most spontaneous, of Bacchiacca's drawings. It is a sketch for the Judah in the same episode, and would almost seem done from the model, although the lackadaisical attitude is of the Peruginesque canon. The cartoon for the entire panel in two separate bits is in the Louvre [Nos. 352, 353]. It is done in black and white chalk, is pricked for transfer, and varies as little as may be from the finished work. More interesting again is another study in the Uffizi [No. 350 bis], this time, although seen almost with Granacci's eyes, and drawn almost with Granacci's hand, certainly from nature. An elderly man, slightly indicated, supports a child a-straddle on a sack, and the same child of Granacciesque profile sits with his hands on the mouth of a

sack. The first served for the little Benjamin, supported by one of his brothers on his ass in the small picture representing the Search for the Cup,\* and the second for the same figure in the companion panel representing Joseph's Brethren finding their Money in their Sacks [Borghese, Nos. 440, 442].

But one other drawing by Bacchiacca [Uffizi, No. 225] need detain us, not indeed for its quality which is lifeless and petty, but for a certain charm it has as a design. Fortune is seen turning her wheel, at the top of which sits a calm grey-beard, while three other men of younger and still younger years cling to its sides in attitudes according with their position on the whirligig.

It thus appears that those of Andrea's companions whom we have classed along with him were even poorer draughtsmen than painters. Nor are we surprised, for we have grown accustomed to find that labour, perseverance, and, if it come to the worst, even theft will help one on to a picture; whilst in drawing the man, as his Creator made him and time and tide have formed him, must needs stand out in all his nakedness.

\* The cartoon for this also is in the Louvre.



## CHAPTER XII

### PONTORMO AND ROSSO

**H**ITHERTO we have been studying masters who, whatever their rank, were to the measure of their abilities climbing upwards towards Olympus. The few that we shall consider henceforth descend with the proverbial ease and even more than the proverbial speed. My interest in the phenomena of dissolution is slight, and I must turn over to other guides the student who would follow, step by step, the dull and disheartening way that leads from a Michelangelo to a Carlo Dolci. I will, however, accompany him a stage or two—not that I wish to see whither the road leads, but that its beginnings are so pleasant.

Yes, the few first gifted artists of a decline are apt to be delightful, and for making this statement let him throw stones at me who has never enjoyed Cellini or Parmigianino, never been won over by Lysippus, never taken pleasure in the less known but scarcely less excellent Pontormo and Rosso. No doubt these names are the names of mannerists, of people who took the first strides downwards and away from the one and only ideal. But they have, notwithstanding, left behind them works of genuine æsthetic value, and it is for this that one loves them, not for any wanton pleasure given by the first whiff of decay. What, then, is the æsthetic value of the earliest phases of art's decline?

Perhaps, if we seriously followed the decline of art, we should discover that the processes of decay, while altogether swifter than those of growth, are not sheerly precipitous. Good habits are cast off only less easily than bad ones; noble traditions only less easily than ignoble; high ideals, than low. The first who venture on the downward path, urged on by the most universal of mental needs, novelty, or by the instinct to assert their individuality, or by the waywardness of their temperament, are wont still to revere the achievements and do homage to the purpose of their more heroic precursors. Very likely they would hear with amazement accusations made against them of apostasy from the creed of their masters. Quite probably they appear to themselves as piously giving the last touches to the task of their predecessors. Thus, to confine ourselves

to Italian Art, we should scarcely think of imputing to Parmigianino irreverence towards Correggio and Raphael, or to Cellini, Rosso, and Pontormo disrespect towards Michelangelo and Andrea del Sarto.

The contrary is notorious; and the paradox might be sustained that the master's purpose reveals itself with completeness to his pupil only. The master can never wholly emancipate himself from the ideals, can never entirely rid himself of the habits imposed upon him while he was young. But the pupil remains a stranger to this conflict in the master's mind; and in the master's art the follower takes cognisance only of those elements which are fashionable, and these will always be elements bearing the least resemblance to what had existed hitherto. He would be as startled to learn that this newness was not all that the master had deliberately striven for, as the master would be shocked when made aware that this was all the achievement wherewith he was credited.

His own purpose, to choose Michelangelo as an instance, had been to give the figure its utmost realisation as form, and so to articulate it that it would be capable of the requisite freedom of action. This absorbed all, or nearly all of even this giant's puissant energies. With the sweat of his brow did he attain his end, and he was jealous of his preparatory studies lest it should get abroad by what hard and repeated blows of Vulcan's midwife hammer Minerva sprang out of his head all armed. But his followers found a seemingly easy task. Form and movement had apparently been conquered and overcome for ever. Their admiration and worship of the conqueror knew no bounds, but, as for his conquest, there it lay prone for any gifted artist to deal with as he pleased. For a century there had been a fierce and ever renewed battle with it. At last it was tamed, and, if you were not old enough to remember what a wild beast it had been before its domestication, it would probably occur to you if you had spirit and courage—it still required both—to think of playing with it. Doubtless the Lion in its struggle with Hercules took shapes and attitudes which the hero was too preoccupied to admire, but which a spectator, lurking out of harm's way in the bushes, had seen and appreciated and reported. Now that the beautiful monster was toothless and clawless, what sport to train it to take the same attitudes—but this time as dance steps!

In the exhilarating spectacle of this play consists perhaps the pleasure we take in the first phases of declining art. A Cellini, a Pontormo, or a Rosso loved form and movement no less than Michelangelo, perhaps more, at all events more consciously, more as connoisseurs. They knew at the start, as *dilettanti*, and did not have to conquer with a lifetime of labour, what was a beautiful shape and what was a beautiful movement. The master had toiled to transfigure visual fact with beauty, but under the glory the hard fact nevertheless remained, with all its sobering and chastening, although at the same time fatiguing and even boring power. But now the temptation grew irresistible to regard beauty as a golden fleece to snatch away and play with in the sun.

And play with it Cellini and Pontormo did. This or that shape, this or that attitude which Michelangelo created, not at all for its own sake but as a by-product of his endeavour to solve some haunting problem—let us say the one how to give a certain figure its utmost action with the least change of place—these shapes and actions appealed to his followers rather as revelations of a new beauty than as solutions of noble problems. And this new beauty they preferred to see isolated, and of course exaggerated, as everything is when isolated from its native concomitants. It needed this only, this isolation and consequent exaggeration of certain of the master's shapes and attitudes, and their recombination with no purpose dictated by the essential and everlasting requirements of the figure-arts, to change the grandeur and dignity of Michelangelo into the decorativeness, the elegance, and the distinction of Cellini and Pontormo.

A first generation of mannerists, then, is one which no longer strives to realise form and movement, for those it finds realised, but endeavours to use for decorative ends, as mere arabesques, the by-products of this realisation, certain shapes and attitudes. It admires form and action sincerely and deeply, and loves them enough to play with them night and day; but its real purpose, of which it, in turn, seems not quite aware, is decoration, is elegance, is distinction, is grace, is charm.

Elegance and distinction first, then grace and charm, all based upon silhouettes created by a greater epoch in its endeavour to attain to form and movement, are thus the characteristic qualities of the earliest phases of art's decline.

These qualities alone, although momentarily so attractive, are not in themselves specifically artistic enough to afford very lasting pleasure. But in their first producers, trained as they were in a severe tradition, they were seldom wholly severed from a command over serious form and action. If they had not been seduced by the new elegance and distinction, they could have achieved marked success along nobler lines. But as their heart's interest was no longer exclusively in form and movement, they tended, despite the dictates of their mind, to neglect them. Not altogether, however. In a less sincere way they still gave heed to the essentials of the figure-arts. Their action is still of members really functioning, their torsos and limbs still do exist, all on a lower level of vitality no doubt, but yet alive enough to suggest no obvious contradiction between their aim and their achievement. In a sense, 'they still were Nature's priests.'

If, then, one likes the first gifted mannerists, it is not for their captivating elegance and distinction alone, but also for their command of form and movement. Add the charm and grace which they revealed, add the winsome waywardness that at times characterises them, and we have reasons in plenty why it is worth while to linger not unlovingly over a Pontormo or a Rosso.



## I

Pontormo first;—as usual in this book, our foremost concern is with Pontormo as a draughtsman. His drawings do not tell the same tale as his paintings. From the start the latter betray the influence and even the direct imitation of Michelangelo. Thus, in Pontormo's almost earliest extant work, the fresco in the Pope's chapel at S. Maria Novella\* representing S. Veronica, the saint has the long oval face which hitherto we have encountered in Michelangelo alone, the most signal instance being the design for a Minerva-like young woman at the British Museum. In the next extant work, the fresco now in the Painters' chapel at the Annunziata, the Child is held in a position recalling several of the drawings done by Michelangelo between 1504 and 1520, in prophetic anticipation, as it were, of the marble group at S. Lorenzo. Instances grow more and more numerous, but these two earliest, dating from before 1516, suffice to demonstrate that Pontormo was from the first awake to Michelangelo's newness and keen to profit by it, and also that he was on good enough terms with him and his circle to be acquainted not only with such works of the revered master as were known to the public but with his drawings as well. Nevertheless, you shall not find among Pontormo's own drawings of this, or of any date preceding 1530, more than rare traces of Michelangelo's influence in his draughtsmanship.

Ready and even eager, then, as Pontormo was to adopt the greater artist's results, he did not, before the two sad last decades of his own career, seem to think it requisite to adopt Michelangelo's peculiar manner of drawing as well. In two studies after the nude, made in connection with the fresco at Poggio à Cajano,† he used Michelangelo's curvilinear system of rendering the contours and the masses. But unless reduced, as by Cungi, to mere calligraphy, this system demands an effort at abstraction of which only the highest artistic genius is capable. Pontormo was not a genius of this power, nor, on the other hand, was he, like Cungi, a mere charlatan. He was a seeker for novelty, for that *Nichtdagewesenes* which has been the ruin of so many fair talents in our day; he was instinct with the desire to assert his own individuality by departing as far as he could from the art out of which he had sprung; he was as wayward and whimsical as his close precursor, Piero di Cosimo. Nevertheless, he had been taught drawing by the most matter-of-fact, the clearest-eyed, the surest-handed draughtsman of the Florentine School; and so indelible were the habits stamped upon him by Andrea del Sarto that they remained like a magical birthmark, and when, finally, he did succeed in removing them, artistic life itself scarcely lingered on. With his temperament and his training, Pontormo, in his early, vigorous years, could not adopt the abstract or synthetic, highly intellectualised methods of

\* Now part of Scuola Femile, Via Luigi Alemanni, Piazza Stazione.

† Uffizi, Nos. 6544, 6555.

Michelangelo. When finally, as we shall see, he did surrender to them, it was to become little more than a distorted and blurred image of the master in decline. He remains interesting even then, I hasten to add, because his confusion was sincere perplexity, because he gained something visionary, because he ended by creating images which remind us of William Blake. But in the years when he painted his best, Pontormo, as a draughtsman, was the closest possible follower of Andrea del Sarto.

He differs from Andrea in many ways. On the one hand, he possessed neither that painter's interest in things seen, nor his power of using the crayon as if it were a magic wand wherewith to lead captive the life-shadow of objects and fix it on paper; nor had he the exemplary docility and the dogged determination which enabled Andrea, one of the most unintellectual of artists, to lift himself to comprehend and realise, as no other follower of Michelangelo did, the intellectual purpose of that genius. On the other hand, Pontormo was nimble-witted, brilliant and playful. His task was not a thing to have done with and be paid for, but a road from which branched off numerous and enchanting lanes, every one of which he had to explore before he could go further. He thus seldom came to an end, and when he did, it was not always to the great satisfaction of his employer, or to his own glory as an artist. What cared he? He had been so charmingly entertained by the way! He had drawn the figures, not only in the few attitudes strictly required by his subject, but in almost every conceivable pose. Such sport it all was to wreak his sprightliness upon his models, contorting their bodies into positions most ridiculous, or denuding them of all flesh and letting them hop about as grinning skeletons. Very pleasant all this, not only for Pontormo but for us spectators as well; but it entailed loss of artistic, no less than of moral, concentration; and as compared with Andrea's, his own drawings produce the effect of being dashed off, hit or miss, of seeking for winsomeness, for elegance, even for fashionableness, rather than for the quickening line which evokes a convincing sense of contact with reality.

It is clear, then, that in his earlier years Pontormo did not so much as pretend to the transubstantiating intellectuality of Michelangelo, and that at the same time he fell short of Andrea's more modest power of conveying the impression of life's own throb. A seeking for newness, for strangeness, whimsicality, sauciness, petulance, a playfulness descending occasionally almost to kittenishness, were apt to interfere with any serious purpose, and always affected his attainments as a draughtsman. His line is relatively summary and his contours tend, although they happily fail, to become silhouettes, as if the decorative arabesque were more his aim than form in movement. But he offers compensations. His best drawings, and they are not few, have a buoyancy, a sparkle, which are exhilarating as wine is to poets, a daintiness of touch which is at least momentarily captivating, and a freshness which obliterates every trace of hard and irksome labour.

It is time to illustrate these general statements regarding Pontormo as a

draughtsman by turning to his drawings. They are numerous, and many of them can neither be connected with extant paintings nor with any others of which adequate descriptions remain. It would be impracticable on that account to treat of them in connection with the artist's gradual evolution; and there would be the further difficulty that owing to the small attention which has hitherto been bestowed upon him, the convincing reconstruction of his career, necessarily preceding such a treatment, would take up an altogether disproportionate place in this book. It will be more expedient, therefore, to dwell upon such groups of sketches only as will enable us to acquire a fair notion of Pontormo's quality at different periods.

Three groups will suffice, although we shall not hesitate to dart out and bring in any other drawing that may serve our purpose. The first group consists of the designs, sketches and studies made in connection with the fresco at Poggio à Cajano. The second comprises the studies for portraits, and certain designs of Pontormo's middle period. The third contains studies of his later years, chiefly for the choir of S. Lorenzo. In the first group, which just precedes that extravagant break with all Florentine tradition exemplified in the frescoes at the Certosa, we behold our artist as the product of Andrea's training and of his own temperament. In the second he is trying to recover his equilibrium after his debauch of Teutonism, but succeeds with difficulty, except in portraits, where the imperative demands of the sitter for a likeness compel him to straightforward fact. In the third group—well, we shall see.

## II

The great hall in the Medicean Villa at Poggio à Cajano was to have been decorated by the new school, by Andrea, his companions and followers. Owing to the death of Leo X. and also to the dilatoriness of the artists, the work remained unfinished until the next generation, when, under the auspices of Cosimo I., it was completed by Alessandro Allori. That clever rhetorician now reigns almost supreme in a space which should have been a monument to Pontormo's genius, for he was commissioned to paint the two ends of the hall. It is not without significance that so considerable a part of the task was confided to him, and it speaks for the high esteem which this artist of four or five-and-twenty had already conquered, and for the appreciation, either on the part of his employers or on his own part, of what was his most specific quality. The side walls could be covered with rectangular compositions which demanded no more specific talents for decoration than were possessed by any painter brought up in the Florentine traditions. We admire Andrea's fresco there, for instance, not for any peculiar felicity of its relation to the space at command, or to its surroundings, but for its qualities as a magnificently designed and nobly achieved pageant. It would please little if at all less had it been done on another scale, in other circumstances, or even as a tapestry.



But the end walls which Pontormo was commissioned to paint from top to bottom entailed a serious problem in decoration. As the ceiling is vaulted the top is arched. At this time, as hitherto had been almost invariable usage, an arched top demanded a lunette separated from and crowning whatever composition came below it. Now any lunette is a space requiring subtler gifts and more thought for filling it properly than will suffice for a rectangle; but these two lunettes were turned into serious problems for the decorator by the large bull's-eye window which pierces each of them. The decorator must find a motive that will at least make us forget the awkwardness of the space at his command. If he can do more, if, instead of merely making us forget the awkwardness of the space, he can take such advantage of it as to make us feel that no other space would have suited him so well—an achievement he will attain only when we cannot separate his motive from his space—then he is, in his kind, one of the great artists.

Enlightened amateurs like the Medici, witnesses of the creation of new worlds of mural decoration in the Sixtine Chapel, in the Vatican Stanze, and at the Farnesina, must have known their man when they allotted such a task to Pontormo. Indeed, I know not which of the artists then living could have acquitted himself better; and saying this, I leave out of count neither Andrea, nor Michelangelo, nor even Raphael. Andrea by this time had become an adept in the grand manner; and as he was never inventive, I cannot conceive what he would have made of a lunette pierced by a large bull's eye. Michelangelo, could we imagine him condescending to such a problem, would perhaps have solved it as he did when he encountered somewhat similar spaces in the Sixtine Chapel. It is true that the lunettes there were entirely subordinate to the frescoes on the ceiling which the artist would not have them rival; it is true that they were bitten out at the bottom by the tops of the windows which turned them into crescents rather than lunettes; it is probable besides that the artist when he came to them was weary of his work and eager to have done. Yet the fact remains that, sublime as are most of the single figures in these strips, they occupy, but have no intimate relation with, the spaces in which we find them. Nor, if we know Michelangelo, should we expect him to consider any motive dictated by the need of ornamenting a space rather than by the requirements of the figure in action. Raphael, the decorator of the spandrels in the hall of Cupid and Psyche, understood, as no other, how to fill an awkward space. He doubtless would have produced a composition as noble as it was suave, as well filled as it was uncrowded and airy, and of great illustrative, even intellectual, worth as well. But he never would have hit upon the altogether fresh and felicitous idea of Pontormo. Raphael could not have thought of it, because he had scarcely grasped the meaning of Michelangelo and the serious problems of the figure-arts at all. Indeed, in Michelangelo, Raphael seems to have appreciated those elements only which could serve his own purposes of Illustration—such mere by-products as heroic types and heroic gestures. To what had necessitated these types and gestures he remained a stranger.

Pontormo, had he been as much an outsider to the art of Michelangelo, could never have created such a motive as he used in the decoration of the lunette at Poggio à Cajano. But he was not a stranger. On the contrary, he seized Michelangelo's meaning fully, even though he neither could nor, at this time, would make it his one and only purpose. He comprehended it well enough, however, to use it as a dilettante when and where it suited him, to think out motives that could have been suggested by Michelangelo's principles only, and to use silhouettes and attitudes created by that master, but to use them for decorative rather than, as Raphael would have done, for illustrative ends.

Besides the finished fresco, we have three designs for these lunettes, one in black and red chalks, and the others done with the pen and wash. The first is little more than a sketch-plan made before Pontormo had lighted upon the idea which bore fruit in the fresco and in the two other designs. In the first plan we see Jacopo labouring with conventional motives, such as Filippino employed in the Strozzi Chapel, and others taken over from Michelangelo, but not yet assimilated. We have the window, and figures holding trophies sitting or leaning against it. Except in the hands of a master capable of making the figure itself genuinely life-enhancing and life-communicating, this is a motive of slight decorative value. Yet Pontormo seemed to find it adequate to his purpose, and dashed off on the back of the same sheet two large studies of a nude in a leaning posture. Then on the same side as the sketch-plan he put two groups of putti embracing, copied almost straight from Michelangelo's on the thrones of his Sixtine prophets and sibyls.

Thought and toil soon engendered the idea which took enchanting form in the one lunette that Pontormo executed; but, leaving that fresco aside for the moment, let us look at the two designs in pen and ink. The bull's-eye window is neither ignored nor neglected. On the contrary, attention is forcibly drawn to it by a heavy frame and an effect of perspective which add to its size and conspicuousness. Around this huge pierced disc is coiled a supple, elastic willow sapling which crosses at the top and then divides at each end into two long branches each with its own twigs. Figures seated on a parapet and others on the ground below it keep the sapling from uncoiling by holding down its branches. The motive, then, is furnished by the sapling which coils, full of green vigour, around the bull's eye, bends down naturally yet in curves which could have no other enframing line than the arc of the lunette, and requires figures to keep it from uncoiling. The presence of figures is thus justified, and their action and attitudes are clearly dictated. The motive remains identical in both designs, but in detail they differ considerably, and significantly. Thus in the one [Uffizi, No. 453<sup>F</sup>] only two figures are engaged in holding down the tree, one draped man on each side standing on the parapet. Three other figures on each side help merely to fill up the space, one seated on the parapet, and two others reclining below on the ground and facing each other. This is well enough, but

six do-nothing figures could not perfectly satisfy an artist who had thoroughly comprehended the principle that a composition must contain no figures which produce the impression of being detachable from it, of being mere stop-gaps; no figures, moreover, which, like the two here who sit crouching with their backs to the window, go against rather than with the general movement of the motive. Hence Pontormo felt himself impelled to make another sketch [Uffizi, No. 454<sup>F</sup>, Plate clxx.] which no follower of Michelangelo could have criticised as design. He might have found much to improve in the draughtsmanship, but in the idea he could have found nothing to alter. Indeed, from the Florentine Cinquecento point of view this is the most admirable design in existence. Every one of the six figures is engaged in holding down the sapling, and the action and attitude of each is strictly determined by its vicinity to the branches, by the movement of the motive, and by the space to be filled. Thus, the male nude on the parapet is made to struggle with both the branches of the forked end, and in the effort is obliged to stem himself against the window, to cross his legs over the parapet, and to hold up his arms. It is a splendid motive, for it exhibits to a marvellous degree the life-communicating action of torso and limbs, gives a sense of firm contact and resistance, fills the space, and is at the same time, because of the twigs which run over him, exquisitely suggestive of a garden god clambered over by a rose-tree. Again, the two figures on the ground, instead of being draped and old, and with their backs to the window, recline, with their bodies and limbs entwining the window, as it were, and thus greatly heightening the coiling movement around the bull's eye. Then it should be noted that there are six figures instead of eight, as in the last design, and this clearness and perspicuity are certainly preferable—particularly from the point of view of the Cinquecentist, whose one aim now was to fill a composition with the largest figures it could bear.\*

If we now turn back to the fresco which Pontormo executed at Poggio à Cajano, we shall quickly perceive that, while he had already hit upon the motive, he either did not yet understand all its possibilities, or was not yet ready to follow its dictates. He does not take it in grim earnest, but plays with it, toys with it. Only two of the figures hold down the branches, and they barely touch it, exerting no real force. Four figures lie reclining or extended on the ground, doing nothing. Two putti sit on the window near the top, and two others on the parapet are there pulling up something with ribbons for no other reason, apparently, than that Pontormo could not get out of his mind the decorative youths on the Sixtine Ceiling. Furthermore, there are in all ten figures, instead of as in the last design six, and then there remains over an expanse of sky, a vacuum abhorrent to the advanced Cinquecentist. Years must have elapsed to give the artist time to

\* Your genuine Cinquecentist was not satisfied with the largest figures a composition could bear. He wanted them just large enough to seem out of proportion to the space at command, and so packed as to produce an impression of breathlessness. This fact was first systematically observed and stated by Prof. Wölfflin in his "Klassische Kunst." I congratulate him on the discovery of the phenomenon, and I understand how the constantly increasing attention to the figure inevitably led to it, but I do not share his æsthetic approval of it.



change from the almost playful painter of the fresco to the relatively earnest and intellectual author of the pen-sketch; and there can indeed be little doubt but that the latter was made ten years and more later when, after the siege of Florence—*rebus Mediceis secundis*—Pontormo was again commissioned to complete the frescoes at Poggio à Cajano, advancing no farther, however, than to the making of cartoons.\*

But with all my admiration of the later design, and with all due recognition of its vast superiority as the matchless solution of a serious problem in filling a space with figures in action calculated to change every difficulty into an advantage, nevertheless my heart goes out toward the fresco. True, it does not, as does the sketch, come as design into more than successful rivalry with Michelangelo and even Raphael; it is not, like the same sketch, art of the nearly highest intellectual order; but it has its own qualities. It is a *fête champêtre*, a midsummer afternoon's frolic of folk half rustic, half gentle, and altogether Arcadian, enjoying under the suffused light of the shimmering sky the breeze that tempers the heat. Take it for what it is, and everything pleases. Why should not the children be sporting on the parapet? Why should not the grown-ups loll in the sunshine? Why should they not lie about as suits refined picnickers? Then, I breathe freely here, more than freely: it is a positive pleasure to draw breath—and I felt a little choked in the grander scheme of the sketch. The colouring, too, takes my fancy. I love its freshness and newness. It has tones and harmonies of a gaiety and audacity which well nigh make it seem a creation of to-day rather than of four centuries ago—and I pity the man who has not felt the delight of encountering, when he least expects it, a touch of ourselves in the midst of ancient things.

### III

The numerous drawings for this fresco, to the more interesting of which we shall presently turn our attention, will, as we examine them, not only give us a clear and almost complete idea of what Pontormo in his first period was as a draughtsman, but will afford occasional glimpses into the workings of his mind while it was advancing from the first design of all, with its almost total lack of ideas, to the scheme which was finally embodied in the finished lunette.

But first a word about these drawings as draughtsmanship. They are in red or black chalk. Pontormo used these materials as one who had understood, loved, and tried to make his own Andrea's method of employing them. Once or twice, just a little earlier,† he even caught the exact accent of life that Sarto seldom failed to make chalks yield. But he was too impetuous and headlong, too impatient of

\* For this purpose and to this time also I would assign the design in the British Museum for a mural painting representing apparently the Death of Seneca. As I take it, this was to have been executed under the existing lunette.

† Hands for the Pontormo altar-piece [Uffizi, No. 6571, Cat. ii.].

detail, and not sufficiently gifted with insight to discover nature's own throb. Although there are numberless proofs of his having drawn from the model, he seldom produces the effect of having noticed more than its silhouette. I do not get the impression from his sketches of things seen by an innocent eye and recorded by a scrupulous hand. Between Pontormo's eye and the object he attempted to draw, an endless series of curves and angles must have intervened to take the place of the real outlines and contours. These curves and angles could scarcely have had an exact correspondence with anything to be seen in nature, but were probably nothing else than the curves and angles of Andrea's drawings as retained by Pontormo's unconscious memory, and as commanded by his own hand—a hand which had strong calligraphic tendencies. Pontormo was thus a draughtsman who scarcely came into direct contact with facts. He was in reality the first link in a chain of successive copyists, each seeing only what the last had recorded and modifying it unconsciously, who brought Florentine Art from Andrea and Michelangelo down to Cigoli and Carlo Dolci.

It may be asked, then, what were Pontormo's merits, what his claim upon our attention, if he could not see nature—which at this time was replaced for him by Andrea's transcripts of it, and later by Michelangelo's? He had his merits nevertheless. In the first place, the curves into which his vision reduced the human figure, his feeling for movement and his skill of hand enabled him to make things very beautiful in themselves; and as they represent but the first stage of copying, they are not yet so far removed from fact as to seem regardless of it, or to appear perfunctory. They almost persuade one into believing not that their artist lacked vision but that he had a manner of notation stronger than his vision. Pontormo's curves are thus all but genuine contours; and as they are actually highly decorative as well, we get almost no impression of soulless schematisation. It is this, then, in the first place, which distinguishes Jacopo from the ordinary mannerist, from the tribe whose prince was Baccio Bandinelli.

Furthermore, if Pontormo was a copyist, he was something else besides. It is true that he did not see things in their own terms, so to speak, but as recorded by Andrea. Objective vision must be denied him, but he did not lack inner feeling for what is essential in the figure-arts. He felt that a line must be more than a coast-line, or a line of demarcation; he knew that it should always be doing something. His line, therefore, is seldom quite without inner significance, and is in its own way thoroughly functional. He also had feeling, if not for plastic values, at least for plastic effects; and his modelling, if seldom convincing, is nearly always pleasantly persuasive. Then he felt strongly the need there is of fully vitalising a figure, and accordingly he never fails to convey a sense of vigorous and free movement. But as he neither grasped fact as Andrea did, and as he still less could rise above fact by having completely assimilated it, as Michelangelo did, Pontormo could not convey the feeling of life and movement

by distributing it all over the body. He knew, however, that it is the joints where pressures and forces are most manifestly interchanged, and calculated that by giving powerful accent to the joints he would convey a lively sense of movement. What success could be attained by putting this idea in action he achieved. It is an idea that approaches dangerously near to bluff, to the stammerer's shouting what he cannot say, but is redeemed by the genuine feeling behind it all, for communicating a sense of life. Add that it is done with a stroke in which there is no tameness, and you will understand why one is inclined to place Pontormo, despite his mannerisms, so close to the great men.

And now for his mannerisms. They were the necessary result of his feeling for plastic effects, for movement, of his singular brilliancy of stroke, and of his lack of direct vision. His drawings are a combination of sinuous, mordant curves whose rapid undulations are checked and hurled back when they surge up the sharp promontories that are his joints. For, having thought of the joints in isolation as almost his sole instruments of conveying force, he inevitably came to give them exaggerated prominence and angularity of shape; and then this angularity tended to invade the rest, and at times, in some of his most spirited sketches, particularly those in red chalk, the hands and the feet and even the heads are drawn with nothing but straight lines.\* Or he lets his curves switch him away from fact, and draws legs which undulate mightily from calf to ankle, or cut the foot almost in twain.†

But with all his exaggerations and mannerisms, Pontormo, in his earlier years at least, never lacks life or determination. His outlines have an extraordinary definition, and his touch an exuberant energy. Hence his drawings have none of that tameness, emptiness, and dryness, intended dash and even swagger, which characterise a Bandinelli and most of the later Italian draughtsmen. Then our artist used his materials in the most accomplished way. A true follower of Andrea, he seldom departed from chalks. Black chalk he uses almost as brilliantly as the Japanese use India ink, and with red chalk, his, as Andrea's, favourite instrument, he gets effects as if the figure he was sketching were translucent. He gives a polish as of metal by letting the white of the paper act as if it were artificial white, but without the rough grain of that material. A perfect instance is the study [Uffizi, No. 6506] of the lower part of a very slender female, nude below the waist. It suggests a Cellini done in a substance that is amber-like in its qualities and yet a metal.

The earliest of the designs for the fresco at Poggio à Cajano was, as we have seen, little more than a sketch-plan, and, except as it reveals the embarrassment of the artist when first confronted with his problem, offers no interest. On its back we find two large sketches, Michelangesque in conception, but drawn

\* Good examples are the three nudes [Uffizi, No. 672], the fascinating studies of children done in connection with the S. Michelino altar-piece [Uffizi, Nos. 6554, 6644 verso, 6520 and 6669] and a dead Christ [Uffizi, No. 6689].

† Instances taken from the drawings for the fresco at Poggio à Cajano are Uffizi Nos. 6511, 6512, 6557, 6646, 6673.



with Pontormo's own freedom and accent, of nudes intended, no doubt, to be leaning against the window. A number of other studies from the nude, or after the partially draped model, fill up the gap between the first design and the appearance above the artist's mental horizon of the motive which he was to develop in the fresco. At first he would seem to have held to a scheme suggested by Michelangelo's Sixtine lunettes, that is to say of figures sitting back to back on steps close to the window. A large nude, but little changed in pose, action and proportions from one of those decorative youths in the Sixtine Ceiling, sits facing to left and pointing to right. No figure, be it noted by the way, could well be more Michelangelesque in conception, but the actual drawing is peculiarly Pontormo's. Here you find the swinging curves, the hard angles, the square joints, and withal a pictorial effect that Michelangelo would have disdained. What the nude is pointing to I cannot imagine, but this gesture seems to have been important, for we find it in another sketch [Uffizi, No. 6727] meant perhaps to take the place of the first, this time of a boy who points in great agitation. He is done in red chalk, and with all the definition and strength of accent that Pontormo could attain with this instrument. For the same place there is the design of yet another figure, reclining on steps with his head on a pillow.

Then the artist, if ever he actually had the idea of steps, seems to have abandoned it, and returned to the parapet that we found indicated in the sketch-plan. It is possible that he thought of a curtain to divide over the window, and to be kept in place by figures standing on the parapet. This, at all events, is suggested by a clearly defined, brilliantly drawn nude of luminous quality, who stands with his back to us, holding a curtain apart, and looking down to left [Uffizi, No. 6741]. But he did not yet abandon the scheme of figures sitting in an attitude which either ignores or even goes counter to the movement of the window. One sheet which, as drawing, is an epitome of Pontormo's peculiarities and qualities [Uffizi, No. 6514], shows us a young man leaning on his left elbow, with his left hand at arm's length clasping the handle of an instrument, with his right leg drawn up, and his left hanging over the parapet, looking out at us from strange spectral eyes. The attitude suggests no fresh idea for the design as a whole, but is no longer slavishly Michelangelesque. This figure seems to have pleased Pontormo himself, for we discover it with slight changes in the design made ten years later. Another nude seated on the parapet, and intended perhaps for the right side of the fresco, may be slightly earlier than the last (for he sits with his back to the window), and is of interest because of something almost Raphaelesque in his calm and suavity.

From the studies known to me I cannot infer at what point Pontormo's mind was illumined by the idea of the coiling sapling, and all its consequences to the composition. There are drawings enough for the fresco before it took final shape, but they are all for single figures, most of which, in altered form, can be found in the lunette. Some of them, it is true, can be fitted in with difficulty, and were

done quite likely with no serious purpose of giving them a place in the composition, but simply because the poses had occurred to Pontormo, and he could not resist sketching them. Thus, what could he have meant to do with the nude lying sideways on its stomach, curled up so as to give prominence to a part of the body which polite European society has usually chosen to ignore? What could have been the intention of another nude lying in an even stranger attitude, and even less seemly, with one leg doubled back so that the foot extends beyond the head? Surely this is but play, curiosity, and the hunger for newness. The result is brilliant beyond words. These two sheets rival the most daring poses, and also the lightning stroke of the ultra-modern French. But the bulk of the drawings were, as I have said, made for figures which, despite serious changes, can be identified in the fresco.

The male figure seated on the ground on the extreme left seems to have given Pontormo some trouble. As early a stage of this figure as any is represented by three sketches on the front and back of a sheet in the Uffizi [No. 6543]. The position and the movement are relatively simple and quiet. More characteristic is the study [Uffizi, No. 6590] wherein we find a nude seated with the knees wide apart, facing us, leaning on his right elbow. This wild-eyed creature seems to have pleased his author, for he is squared for enlarging. Still more interesting is a larger design of a draped man seated very much like the last, but turning to the left, with a scroll in his right hand. He seems to be writing with inspired look and eloquent gesture. Then come several sheets, which are among the most brilliant that Pontormo ever drew. The slightest is a faint scrawl [on Uffizi No. 6632] of a thick-set nude squatting with legs wide apart and feet crossed. The same takes more definite shape in a black chalk study [Uffizi, No. 6515] of a nude with spectral eyes, shading his brow with his right hand—as draughtsmanship one of the most characteristic of our artist's performances. Still the identical attitude is maintained in three studies in black chalk on the front and back of another sheet [Uffizi, No. 6685]. The one on the front has, to a remarkable degree, the swinging curves of Pontormo, but it also has contours of rare definition. We end with the most finished and, as it happens, the most interesting sketch of the series [Uffizi, No. 6599]. It is of a youthful nude gazing out of large eyes under a brow shaded with his right hand while he sits pressing the ground with his left hand. His right leg is drawn up and his left curled under him.

But none of these correspond exactly with the figure that was painted, which became more quiet than any of these sketches, more the subdued peasant fatigued with years. For the figure seated next to him and turning toward him there is no study of a pose quite identical. But it is probable enough that the sketch [Uffizi, No. 6632] of a youth dressed in the costume of the time seated on the ground, turning to right, was done for this figure, although in the fresco his head is turned to left. For the male nude on the parapet who leans back

and stretches up to seize the branches of the tree, there is a slight sketch on a sheet at the Uffizi [No. 6515], but the action of the arm is so different that it makes one question whether Pontormo at this stage had already hit upon the motive of the coiling sapling and of the figures that hold it down. For the boy who sits between the last figure and the window, pulling up something from the ground by a ribbon, there is a rough but vigorous study in black chalk [Uffizi, No. 6651], from which the artist did not depart in the painting. Two or three further studies of putti for this work may be mentioned here. All are in black chalk, and none in the fresco occur exactly as they are sketched. In one [Uffizi, No. 6646] the child with his left leg curled under him, and his right swinging over the parapet, brandishes something aloft in his right hand. In another [Uffizi, No. 6512] it is the left leg which swings over the parapet, but in other respects it resembles the last. In a third [Uffizi, No. 6511] a child wildly straddles a fowl. This is again a most typical drawing, violently swung, in violent action, impish, almost spectral.

If, excepting the child on the parapet, we have found no studies for the three men on the left of the lunette which correspond exactly to the painting, we have, on the other hand, for the three women on the right several sketches, either perfectly identical in pose and action with those in the fresco, or so close to them as to leave no doubt that they represent a late stage in the evolution of the composition, when Pontormo had already found the determining motive. Toward the beginning of the chapter I had occasion to speak of two studies after the male nude done in Michelangelo's curvilinear system, and in a manner approaching that master's draughtsmanship as closely as if they had been drawn by the closest follower. Here it suffices to indicate that they were made for the figure reclining on the extreme right, the charming picknicking young woman in light summer gown who suggests everything but academic study and Michelangelo's highly synthetised nudes. Then we possess a sketch, from the male model still, but this time draped [Uffizi, No. 6515 verso]. On the left beside it is drawn a leg, that of the shepherdess seated on the parapet and exactly as we find it in the painting, so that when this study was made the design for the whole work must have been fixed. We have the reclining young woman again, but now draped [Uffizi, No. 6673], but not yet so young and so gay as in the fresco, in fact a trifle too like a sibyl. On the back of the same sheet we encounter a beautiful sketch for the other reclining young woman. Finally, there are three studies for the most dainty, the most girlish figure in the work, perhaps the most girlish in Florentine art, the young woman sitting on the parapet, showing her bare right leg, and holding a bow. In one large sketch [Uffizi, No. 6731], chiefly for the drapery of the lower part, her exact pose had not yet been determined. But two further studies [Nos. 6530 verso, 6531] complete one another and give nearly the whole of this delightful creature as she was transferred to the painting. And the drawing is one of Pontormo's most fascinating.



## IV

The death of Leo X. put an end for the time to the decoration of the great hall at Poggio à Cajano. In the fresco that Pontormo painted for that hall he remained, as we have seen, with all his newness and all his striving for originality, the faithful follower, on the whole, of Andrea. He saw the world not in terms of itself, so to speak, but in those of his master's vision; and he saw it thus because, despite the superiority of his own fancy and the greater depth of his own inner feeling, he had no marked power of seeing with his own eyes the world without him. Hence perhaps the fundamental reason for his restlessness. Dumb driven cattle will follow without questioning the word of command. With a little mentality added, they will be as convinced of what they are told to see as if they had actually seen. The person of superior mind but defective vision is almost of necessity a sceptic. If he have an ardent, enthusiastic temperament, he will throw himself into another's way of seeing things with an enthusiasm and an eloquence calculated to persuade outsiders, and by reaction himself; but well as he may succeed in persuading his neighbours, he has seldom convinced himself. At the fit occasion he will divest himself of the stranger's vision with the same enthusiasm wherewith he took it up, and with equal ardour will he put on a new pair of spectacles. These seldom turn out more satisfactory than the first, and it generally happens that, more than he is aware, his way of seeing has been lastingly affected by the first pair, if for no other reason than simply because they were the first.

So Pontormo, after eight years of advocating Andrea's manner and acting as intermediary, as it were, between Andrea and his own younger or somewhat less favoured contemporaries, such as Rosso, suddenly cast it from him, and attempted what no gifted Florentine had ever attempted before, to see things systematically and wholly through Northern eyes. True those eyes were Dürer's, and what Dürer had seen and recorded was so sovereign and sublime that greater Italians than Pontormo, Andrea himself, and even Titian, incorporated into their own paintings many a figure of his, or even entire episodes taken out of engravings. But to none of them had it occurred that Dürer's way of seeing was superior to their own, or even as good. It took an Italian as unconvinced of his own way of seeing, as nimble in spirit, and as restless as Pontormo, to attempt to cast behind him the envied heritage of ages, and to endeavour to reproduce the gnarled lines and dry contours of a Northerner, even though a Dürer. The five frescoes which he painted at the Certosa directly after finishing the lunette at Poggio à Cajano were done with the ambition to catch the exact accent of the great Albert. The originals have as good as perished, but Jacopo da Empoli's copies (at the Palazzo Vecchio) tempt one to believe that, taken in and by themselves, they must have been remarkable works, of a kind that might have delighted Dürer, and superior to what was achieved by any of his German followers. As one looks at these copies

and, in the mind's eye, informs them with the life that Pontormo must have given them, one is amazed at the artist's versatility. When we stop to recall what it cost a Sebastiano, or even an Andrea, to attempt to draw the bow of Michelangelo—an instrument which, after all, was not entirely strange to them—we are astonished to see how far Pontormo shot with the arrows of Dürer. Pontormo, just because he lacked a way of seeing that was his own, must have had a singular facility of adopting other ways of seeing. But it undoubtedly took hard work as well. What has become of the hundreds of drawings he must have made on this occasion? I know but one, of no importance, a study of drapery [Uffizi, No. 6648].

By his friends this excursion into Dürer-land was regarded as a debauch, and an echo of their indignation comes to us from Vasari's pages, on the whole so respectful to our artist, so charitable even, and yet so appreciative of Pontormo's failings. Whether Jacopo was harried out of this manner by public opinion, or whether he soon had enough of his freak, on the completion of the Certosa frescoes, he gave up the attempt to get Dürer's accent, and scarcely any work of the rest of his career would lead us to suspect that he had ever heard of Dürer. But this escapade unbalanced our artist, and he never again recovered his equilibrium. At first, and no doubt despite himself, he swung back towards Andrea, but he was too intellectually minded and too unanchored to resist the ever swelling waves of Michelangelo's influence—all the more irresistible as the great master passed most of the next ten years at Florence.

In these years Pontormo painted little of lasting interest save portraits. But his drawings in these same years are scarcely inferior to those of earlier date. They lack in that vigorous decision, in that accent of intimate contact with things seen, caught from Andrea; they become more and more abstract, without convincing us that they are based, as in the case of Michelangelo's studies, on solid premisses. But, on the other hand, they have gained rather than lost in swing, in freedom, and in amplitude; and when the presence of the sitter demanding a likeness kept our artist close to facts, he made studies which, as we shall see presently, are among the masterpieces of design.

First let us look at his other sketches of this period, and as we cannot examine them all, let us confine ourselves chiefly to three pictures painted toward 1530, and among the most interesting of these years: the Altar-piece now in the Louvre; the Martyrdom of S. Maurizio, which exists in two versions, one in the Pitti Gallery and the other at the Uffizi; and the "Pietà" at S. Felicità.

The Louvre Altar-piece is a picture not devoid of merit, although to appreciate its qualities we must know the painter. We see St. Anne with the Virgin, a slender, wistful creature, seated on her lap, she, in turn, holding the Child. These three figures form a group arranged according to the most scientific Michelangelesque canons, and yet unforced, even charming. The joining and intertwining of the hands and arms are, by the way, not unworthy of one who, like

Pontormo, had begun as the pupil of Leonardo. On each side we see two saints, the younger one nude or almost nude, and inspired by Michelangelo's Christ of the Minerva, or some kindred idea. But a delightful episode remains to be mentioned. It is a roundel under the Virgin's feet, in which we see the lords of Florence marching in all their burgher splendour, accompanied by their mace-bearers and pennoned trumpeters. Charmingly grouped, and daintily done, these figures constitute one of the prettiest bits of genre-like painting in classical Italian art. But of this there is no trace in the sketchy design in ink and wash [Uffizi, No. 460, Plate clxxi.] for the picture. Nor does the design make up in other ways for the lack of this episode. Indeed I cannot say that I find the drawing interesting except as a specimen of Pontormo's draughtsmanship in these materials, at this period.\*

The exact opposite is the case with the Martyrdom of S. Maurizio, the design and drawings for which are much more valuable than the paintings. The first is a splendid, almost triangular composition in red chalk [Hamburg, Plate clxxii.] intended evidently to be complete by itself, but corresponding to only the upper left-hand corner of the Pitti panel. We see above, on a knoll, the saint baptizing a multitude, then, in a fold of the hills, an army of horsemen approaching, and, in the foreground, nudes, some on horses, charging at other nudes. The forms are puffy and slovenly; they have lost the relative precision of Pontormo's earlier years, and do not yet pretend to the abstraction of his later manner. But there is no lack of vigorous action and the touch, in places at least, is still full of nerve and vitality. It is not this design, however, to which I would draw special attention, but to three studies in black chalk at the Uffizi for the youthful standard-bearer on the right. Two of them [Nos. 6518, 6722] are powerful sketches, of superbly swung curves and energetic accent, for the horseman alone. In another [No. 6675] we see him with his waving plumes, and an old woman pointing to him, over a field of carnage.

The "Pietà" in its various phases is a subject which occupied Pontormo's attention at different periods of his career. It was a theme so often imposed upon artists at that time, and so admirably treated by the best of them, that it was well calculated to absorb Jacopo and to arouse his emulation. Of his various paintings of this subject mentioned by Vasari two only are known to be extant, the one in the Academy and the other at S. Felicità. But drawings exist for others still. Thus, Uffizi Nos. 6689, 6691 are for a panel on which he must have been working at the time that he was engaged upon the fresco at Poggio. This must have been a creation of great calm and dignity. Then there is a fine design for a lunette [Uffizi, No. 300] dating from about 1530. But his distaste of being like unto others, and his desire to improve upon them, drove him to curious experiments. So, in one small sketch [Uffizi, No. 6622] we see him

\* Other sketches for this work are unknown to me, unless indeed a somewhat over-elaborated one in the Uffizi [No. 6681] be for the head of the Virgin.



taking the composition of Andrea's gorgeous panel at the Pitti Gallery, and "improving" upon it in the most startling way. He has kept close to Andrea's grouping, but has thrown the dead Christ like a scarf about the neck of an erect figure. Or again, he has the singular idea of transforming with the least possible change Michelangelo's Leda into the expired Saviour [Uffizi, No. 6611].\*

The altar-piece of S. Felicità is free from absurd extravagances, and indeed one does not quite understand, if one takes them in earnest, as perhaps they should not be taken, Vasari's sweeping censures of it. He seems to find in this work a flagrant instance of Pontormo's continuous search for newness of arrangement and strangeness of treatment. For my part, I feel myself irresistibly attracted toward this "Pietà." The blond, almost monochrome colouring, and the insufficient contrasts of light and shade which Vasari blames, all count for pleasantness to me, give a freshness to the tone and a luminosity to the substances which remove them into another sphere of reality. The sentiment is intense, yet delicate, and the arrangement and action unhackneyed, yet not far-fetched. The composition consists of two groups and two crowning figures. The principal group comprises the dead Christ supported by two men behind Him, and by another in front, who, in nearly kneeling posture, sustains the burden on his shoulders, as well as a young woman who stoops pityingly over the Saviour's head. The other group is of the Virgin who is about to faint away, of a woman who runs up to sustain her, and of another who looks on. These two groups complete one another spatially, are united intimately by the play of the hands, and joined at the top by two beautiful figures who look on and sympathise. But one of the heads, although fine in itself, were better away, for it takes no part in the action, and is not otherwise needed. It is a portrait head which Jacopo was probably required to insert.

Several studies for this interesting picture exist. In the first place a sheet [Uffizi, No. 6588] with a large kneeling nude and two superb heads of Michel-angelesque character, all made in connection with some earlier idea of this work than the one that came to execution. In the entire range of Pontormo's activity as a draughtsman we shall scarcely find again heads so heroically conceived as these two, and so largely drawn. Two sketches for the dead Christ [Uffizi, Nos. 6540, 6619], one not quite so mannered and empty as the other, stand in pitiful contrast to the first sheet. But our artist retrieves himself in a delightful, undulating study for the beautiful nude who stoops over the fainting Virgin, and yet more in several sketches from the life for various heads. Two [Uffizi, No. 6627], one of an older, graver woman, and the other of a younger and sweeter, were both for the woman we see over the Virgin's right arm, different from either of these

\* In this connection we may draw attention to a sketch for the Nailing to the Cross [Uffizi, No. 6671], a most remarkable composition regarding which much might be said for which there is no space here, and more still for which this is not the place.

sketches, not so piteous as the one, nor so winning as the other. Another sheet [Uffizi, No. 6577] offers a study for the head of the kneeling figure, but more firmly constructed, simpler and more convincingly real than in the painting. A third study [Uffizi, No. 6587] is for the head of the intruder.

## V

These heads were really portrait-studies, and remind us that we have still to consider many other studies for portraits by Pontormo. They will go far to convince us that he is to be counted among the great masters in that art. Two circumstances have conspired to take away from his fame. In the first place, his own moodiness and freakishness, which not only made him an artist of uneven achievement but must have caused him to be the despair of his sitters. He would follow his own whims to the extent of refusing altogether to work for great princes or dawdling over what he had begun for them, while he would slave over and perfect masterpieces for the meanest artisans. He thus allowed his own pupil, one who did nothing but imitate and deaden his own style, Bronzino I mean, to get by steadiness and reliability so far ahead of him in the favour of the great, that he, Bronzino, became, as it were, the court painter of Florence. Bronzino thus grew and has remained famous as a portrait-painter, and as he achieved nothing in this pursuit which he did not take from his master, it followed, naturally, that in later ages the relatively few portraits by Pontormo that remained were attributed to Bronzino. And this is the second reason why Pontormo has never received his due.

He will get recognition when it becomes better known that he, and not Raphael, of whom it is by no means unworthy, was the author of the portrait of a Cardinal in the Borghese Gallery, and that he and not Bronzino was the painter of that great Cinquecento Florentine masterpiece at Frankfort, the Portrait of a Lady with a lap dog. In this panel we discover all that we admire in Bronzino and much more: the dignity, the consciousness of rank and station, the fine arrangement and the precise contours, but without the stiffness, without the dryness, without the deadness of touch, of the more famous craftsman. We find here, on the contrary, an amplitude, an ease, a subtlety of interpretation, a liveliness of execution seldom even attempted by Bronzino. We are brought into contact with an artist of incomparably greater range, with one who painted and drew men in many moods, from the lightest to the gravest, from the simplest to the most stylish—yet always not only within the strict canons of his art but even within the vision of form created and imposed by Michelangelo.

At this point I would fain introduce a dissertation on the relations between the portrait and the plastic and graphic arts, in which dissertation I should endeavour to make it as clear to others as it is to me that the portrait is wholly dependent

upon current conceptions of form, action, and craftsmanship. I should go further and suggest that it is by means of this dependence of the portrait upon the canons of form and action prevalent in sculpture and painting, that the great artist fixes the ideal of type and carriage which some few men realise, while the others, by imitating them, strive after it—that it is through the portrait chiefly that “nature imitates art.”

But this theme must find a fitter occasion for its development. Its bold enunciation may suffice, however, to give the reader a notion of the ground I have for saying that Michelangelo, notwithstanding his hatred of portraiture, did more than any other artist whatsoever, Titian not excepted, to determine the portraiture and thereby the aspect of the modern European. He did it neither directly nor intentionally. But the form and action which he had perfected in accordance with the imperative demands of the essential in the figure-arts seemed to a Pontormo too noble and too impressive to be left to stocks and stones alone. How well certain people would look, could he only induce them to take on the air, to assume the carriage of Michelangelo's creations! And if human flesh is not so pliant as to submit to sudden transformation, his art was plastic enough to paint them now as they could be if they but took thought and trouble—and once painted, there the portraits were as ever-present monitors.

It was upon some such impulse that Pontormo painted the Lady at Frankfort, casting her into a mould formed by Michelangelo's ideal.\* I cannot recall among Jacopo's pictures other portraits of like nature, and if they exist they remain hidden under other names. But among his drawings there is no lack of them. A sketch, freely but exquisitely limned in red chalk [Uffizi, No. 17769], is of a refined and stately young woman of high social position, a little less imposing but not inferior to the Frankfort Lady. A large design in the same materials has an equal splendour of carriage, and yet is so calm and collected, so quietly arranged that it still passes as Leonardo's [Uffizi, No. 414, Plate clxxiii.]. In a slighter sketch and of somewhat later date [Uffizi, No. 6680] we have an older woman of a dignity and stateliness from which every touch of unnaturalness is removed by an expression of the uttermost straightforwardness. The informing presence of Michelangelo's ideal is more manifest in the splendid black chalk design for the portrait of an artist or artisan in his apron [Uffizi, No. 6698, Plate clxxiv.], a figure of superb carriage yet of perfect ease of pose, a most convincing presentation of a highly individualised as well as gifted personality. Another design in black chalk at Chatsworth, of admirable quality as drawing and as interpretation, clenches my argument, for this young man is directly modelled on Michelangelo's statue of Giuliano in the sacristy of S. Lorenzo.

We need not bring further sketches to witness. The few I have cited suffice to establish that Pontormo was the first to introduce Michelangelo's form and action

\* Pontormo may have had in mind some actual work by Michelangelo, or some drawing like that of the young woman of Minerva-like aspect, at the British Museum.



into portraiture. The idea was then turned to account, but never with such perfection, by Pontormo's pupil and imitator Bronzino, through whom it became generalised, doing much to determine portraiture ever since, and thereby to mould the ideal type of the modern lady and gentleman. But while Bronzino, because of the limitations of his mind no less than of his hand, confined himself to the same air and carriage, whether the subject did or did not permit, Pontormo—who but failed of being a genius, who could be in perfect sympathy with his sitter, grasp the spring of his physical action and penetrate his spirit—could not use form like a mere mould. We thus find, not alone in his earlier years, when perhaps he had not yet comprehended the full value of Michelangelo's art, but in his later and even latest years, when in other pursuits he had become the mere shadow of the greater artist—we find Pontormo, when in the presence of his sitters, drawing as if he had never heard of Michelangelo, with a spirit and in a manner as varying as his subjects. Let us now look at a few sketches more. They will help to make my meaning clearer.

From his earlier years we have the study [Uffizi, No. 452] for an elegant young man whose over-sensitive face is helped to a look of effeminacy by the too ample womanish robes then in fashion. Another sheet [Uffizi, No. 6667] of somewhat later date exhibits two sketches of a winning, large-eyed lad, the smaller of which sketches is flower-like in touch and bewitching as a presentation. Still another [Uffizi, No. 449, Plate clxxv.] shows a turbaned youth who looks out of wistful eyes, appealing to us as if to help him solve the mystery of himself. Then we have [Uffizi, No. 6701] a sweet soldier boy in plumed hat and trunk-hose, with his sword dangling by his side, resting on his lance with his left hand on his hip. We have also [Uffizi, No. 443] a young man in a large cloak holding the horn upon which he has been playing—simplicity itself in character, and in touch almost a Holbein—and on the back of the same leaflet the portrait of an ecclesiastic, no less direct, no less Holbeinesque. When you look at the two profiles on the front and back of yet another sheet at the Uffizi [No. 6668], you could believe that Holbein himself had drawn them. Then you get a resolute bold character in the study of a soldier in undress [Uffizi, No. 463], perhaps the Francesco Guardi who was painted during the siege of Florence. Finally, I would draw attention to two busts of old women from Pontormo's latest years. One of them [Uffizi, No. 6573, Plate clxxvi.] is interesting as being so like some of the female regents of the old Frank Hals. The other [No. 451] would remind us for its perfectly realised construction and penetrating interpretation, as well as for its splendour of pictorial effect, of Rembrandt, if she were not arranged into a collectedness, into a statue-like completeness which none but Italian genius could achieve.

## VI

While examining the last design for a lunette at Poggio à Cajano, we had occasion to observe that when making it Pontormo must already have grasped all that he could understand of Michelangelo's purpose. The master himself must have believed that Jacopo had understood him, for Michelangelo chose Pontormo to colour for him two cartoons that he made at the same time or directly afterwards. Nevertheless, our artist, as a draughtsman, still kept his independence, and while we see him sinking steadily deeper into a world far less his own than ever Andrea's had been, it was not for some years yet that he began systematically to draw in the exact manner of Michelangelo. Thus in a remarkable design [Uffizi, No. 6602], representing perhaps some scene of pagan incantation, we see five nudes as Michelangelesque as any that were ever constructed except by the master himself. Proportions, action, pressures, all are there. But nothing could well be farther away from 'il Divino' than the pictorial handling and the technique of wash. Better still, we have a fine design [Uffizi, No. 6534] of a grandeur of conception that Michelangelo himself could scarcely have surpassed, and suggested moreover by his cartoon of Venus and Cupid, which Pontormo some few years before had copied. It is of a strong nude woman, an Earth-Mother, reclining on the ground and turning from the book in which she has been reading to gaze down upon the child who nestles at her breast. Certainly no one had so understood not only the specifically artistic but also the spiritual purpose of Michelangelo as the author of this noble design. Yet, as handling, it is still independent, is, in fact, without any of that meticulous smoothness and dryness into which the great master had already fallen. The transformation is consummated in an interesting study [Uffizi, No. 6586, Plate clxxvii.] of a female nude, endless and gigantic, reclining in an attitude intended to display the utmost of the figure in action. Doubtless Pontormo had in mind some sketch by Michelangelo like the one now at Vienna of a nude female leaning with her face and breasts against a cloth, and, like that, Pontormo's figure enhances the firmness and solidity of the torso and limbs by contrasting them with the flimsier substance of the drapery wherewith they are in contact. And a pose better calculated to bring out all the strains and pressures of the human body, and to exhibit more of its significant surfaces to the eye could not easily have been invented, not even by Michelangelo himself. And indeed, except for the wrong proportions, that master when working, as he now too frequently did in a dry meticulous manner, could scarcely have improved upon this sketch.

The few studies that remain to be discussed were made in connection with the frescoes at S. Lorenzo, upon which Pontormo spent the last eleven years of his life. When uncovered after his death, they gave no satisfaction even to an age

which worshipped the faintest shadow of Michelangelo. Vasari, with all his sympathy for Pontormo, confesses that he can make nothing of them, that the Last Judgment could not be more confused on the Day of Wrath than it was in the painting, that most of the compositions made him dizzy, and that, fine as many of the torsos were, they had small or withered limbs attached to them. A later age judged no better of them, and in the eighteenth century they were decently buried under whitewash.

Pontormo is reported to have worked upon them with the sweat of his brow and with the melancholy of a man prescient of failure. Perhaps he knew that it had been hoped Michelangelo would undertake the task,\* and the ambition seized him to vie with the greater master on his own ground. It was reported even that he boasted he would surpass Michelangelo. If ever he strayed so far from sense, he was sufficiently punished, not only in the result, but in the years of misery that he spent.† But it is likely that he no longer retained more than shreds of individuality—such shreds as now and then appear among the drawings for the frescoes, one, for instance, for the Deluge [Uffizi, No. 6528]. He had so thoroughly grasped Michelangelo's purpose, and lived himself so completely into his world, that sooner or later it must have occurred to him that, to render it properly, he must do it with the means that the great master himself was using. Hence a slavish imitation on Pontormo's part of Michelangelo's manner as he last knew it. Now the last year when there could have been close and continuous contact between them, was the one in which Michelangelo made those designs for Cavalieri, which, whatever their merits, and they are great, are characterised by a painful meticulousness and a certain lifelessness of touch.

This, then, was the phase of Michelangelo that Pontormo during his last years strove to make his own. He almost succeeded, but the unhappy man was not aware that in these designs of Michelangelo's it is not the quality of the draughtsmanship but the splendour of the ideas that is of value. And although Pontormo was among the most intellectual of painters, yet he was perhaps even further below Michelangelo as a thinker than as an artist. So his last drawings have little charm of touch, and as little vigorous thought. But when not mere academies, such as a sketch for an Eve expelled from Eden [Uffizi, No. 6715], he still retains a sense of beauty, as for instance in an exquisite female nude as dainty and graceful as an Egyptian Queen of the most artistic dynasties [Uffizi, No. 6535]; and he acquires a curious visionary, mystic strain which, as I already have said, reminds us of Blake. We discover a likeness in the uncouth but awful shapes, in the coiling acrobatic movements, as well as in their subordination to ends at once allegorical and ornamental. Nor is the likeness altogether

\* Frey's *Briefe an Michelagnolo*, p. 274.

† Fragments of a journal that he kept during these years may be read in Gaye's *Carteggio*, iii. 166, and I understand that the entire diary is to be published presently. I take this occasion of drawing attention to a letter by Pontormo published by Bottari in his "*Lettere Pittoriche*," i. p. 20. Therein our artist appears as a subtle, humorous thinker and as an exquisite, rather affected writer.



accidental, for neither had ever seen the world as it is, yet each had a strong feeling for life. What influence Michelangelo had upon Pontormo we have noted. It is no less manifest that it was to Michelangelo chiefly that Blake owed what acquaintance he had with the human figure. No wonder then, if, when looking at Pontormo's design for the Creation of Eve with Christ as Judge [Uffizi, No. 6609], or at the two for Noah conversing with the Lord [Nos. 6508, 6749], or, better still, at the Death of Abel, we get in the contorted limbs, in the patriarchal figures, in the allegorical intentions and in the pattern-like compositions, suggestions of many an illustration, engraving, or water-colour by William Blake.

## VII

Pontormo had but two followers whom we need consider. The fame of the one has greatly surpassed that of his master; whereas, of the other, not even the name will be known to many of my readers. Yet were we to base an estimate upon the drawings that these two pupils have left behind them they would change places, Naldini rising to reputation and Bronzino sinking into obscurity.

What has happened to the countless drawings that a painter like Bronzino must have made in the course of his brilliant career? I doubt whether much over a dozen remain altogether, and one is tempted to fancy that, aware of his dulness as a draughtsman, he made away with his sketches. The few that do remain are singularly devoid of interest, and bear out the severe criticism made by Vasari on Bronzino's drawings.\* Only two need arrest our attention. They will more than suffice to do him justice. They are heads, one of a young woman almost in profile to left, looking down [Uffizi, No. 577, Plate clxxviii.], and the other of a youth also looking down to left through half-closed eyes [Uffizi, No. 10894]. Both are attractive as types, and drawn in black chalk with a neatness that we expect of Bronzino, but also with a feebleness of touch that renders them totally uninteresting as draughtsmanship.

On the contrary, drawings by Naldini are numerous, and so full of spirit, so pictorial, so lively in execution that an hour spent looking over his albums at the Uffizi must count among the pleasures of the student of Cinquecento Florentine draughtsmanship. He based his own manner not on the one that Pontormo then in his old age was practising, but on that master's earlier style. Naldini's drawings are thus an instance of successive copying at the second remove, yet they remain so close in characteristics and retain so much of the quality of the original, I mean Andrea, that many a sheet by Naldini still passes unquestioned under the greater artist's name. Indeed you will even find sketches by Naldini solemnly catalogued as Michelangelo's—a fact which speaks for their relative excellence.

\* In life of Lappoli.

## VIII

Rosso was born in the same year as Pontormo, but a whole artistic generation appears to lie between them, and his art seems based as much upon Pontormo's as the latter's upon Andrea's. This is not the place to try to account for the phenomenon—of which many plausible explanations might be offered. Here it must suffice to record that Rosso had even less, far less power of direct vision than Pontormo, and that, as the latter saw the world in the contours of Andrea, so Rosso seems to have seen it in the terms of Pontormo. But it may be questioned whether he saw the world at all, whether he had ever seen more than Pontormo's presentations of it. He apparently had the disadvantage of being acquainted with only a second-hand instead of a direct transcript of nature, and he was further handicapped by lacking that feeling for the rendering of values of energy and of life, the impulse from within, in short, which characterised Pontormo.

With no inner impulse for the essential in the figure-arts, with no power of seeing for himself, with only a second-hand presentation of things to start from, Rosso would merit not a moment's consideration, if he had not certain compensating merits. What were they? Of no real importance, if you will, judged by great standards, yet qualities which captivated his contemporaries, and in weaker moments please one still.

They are alluring rather than sterling qualities—great ease of handling, sparkle, dash, the *bravura* Vasari speaks of, fresh colouring, striking light and shade, and a certain daintiness, gracefulness, even elegance of type. Shall I shock the grave reader if I confess that I derive from Rosso's works a pleasure not unlike the one that certain phases of recent French art have given me—the picture-posters of Chéret for instance?

And speaking of French art reminds me of an historical reason for giving Rosso a certain place in our esteem. He was, more than any other artist, the founder of the school of Fontainebleau, and thus started French painting, which thereupon broke completely with northern tradition, on the career which has never since been seriously interrupted. But Rosso achieved even more perhaps. He and Cellini may be held responsible for that elegance and grace of carriage and manner which has ever since distinguished the French. Doubtless the French had every aptitude for shaping themselves in accordance with the models furnished them by artists, and in the thirteenth century, when they already held the supremacy of fashion, their own sculptors furnished them as well as the rest of Europe with ideals. But these had long since disappeared, and just before the time we are now considering the French were scarcely less ungainly and provincial in aspect and dress than other northern peoples. I repeat that the rapid and triumphant change must have been due in the first place to Rosso and Cellini, who

introduced representations of pride, of distinction, of elegance, which they in their turn had derived both directly and indirectly from Michelangelo. And lest I go further and accuse this austere genius of having been one of the principal contrivers of Parisian fashions, let us speedily turn to Rosso as a draughtsman.

There is really not much to say of Rosso's specific qualities as a draughtsman. His chief instrument was red chalk, and when he was not dashing away to get a striking effect of light and shade, he used this wonderful material timidly, even nigglingly, as if he had no feeling whatever for accent and touch. It occurs to one that he may have been aware of the feebleness of his line, and that his dash may have been—if I may use the phrase—a sort of bluff. Many of Rosso's sketches, with all their attractiveness as illustrations, produce on first sight almost the impression of copies after Pontormo, as, for instance, the foppish Cupid, of almost pure Seicento feeling, in the Uffizi [No. 17762]. At times he is even worse, as in the famous *macabre* design for the skeletons [Uffizi, No. 6499]. There, in a work completed in 1517, in the heyday of the Renaissance, when he was but one-and-twenty, he combines jaded fantasticality and monstrosity of form with palsy of hand in a way that anticipates the worst northern engravers of two or three generations later.

These and other drawings in the careful manner prove even more. They prove that Rosso had no direct acquaintance with the nude. For him, the nude could never have been more than something to work into a pattern, and that something he took from Michelangelo, and distorted according to the requirements of his merely illustrative or ornamental purpose. He did not hesitate to give the nude any length, to twist it in any way that his arabesques demanded: as for instance in a ludicrous combination of overweening pride of expression with fabulous length of figure—a design for a Meeting of Isaac and Rebecca at the Well [Uffizi, No. 14610].

Rosso, then, is as a draughtsman attractive only when, whatever his material, he makes a bold dash at taking, over-accentuated effects of light and shade. His other characteristics remain the same, but in so far as they are qualities they are enhanced, and in the degree that they are faults they are masked by this treatment. One is even ready to be indulgent to his drawing the female waist as the almost rectangular object that we find, for instance, in the Louvre design of bastard Michelangelesque character, representing four women and an old man conversing together [Louvre, No. 189, Plate clxxix.]—one is tempted to forgive it because one feels that Rosso could scarcely have done otherwise, seeing that he must have regarded the human figure, aside from its obvious expressiveness, as little else than a convenient contrivance for displaying lights and shadows.

But a certain poetry, not of a very high order I admit, yet poetry of a kind, is inherent in the free, will-o'-the-wisp play of light and shade—a poetry which gave a momentary charm to recent "impressionist" painting. And this alluring poetry



plays about most of Rosso's pictures and all his rapid drawings. It is needless to speak of them all, although mention must be made of a vivid design in bistre for a Holy Family [Milan, Museo Civico], the Louvre sketch in red chalk for a Mother of Mercy [No. 1579], and the Uffizi drawing in black chalk for an altar-piece [No. 479]. It will suffice to note the fascinating red chalk study that we reproduce [Plate clxxx.] of a fragment of a design perhaps for an Olympus. There is a charm of mere fancy about this fragment of which I need not speak; but I would draw attention to the flicker of light and shade, and to the vagueness and touch of glamour thus introduced. You scarcely think of looking deeper and observing that the figures are nearly formless, wholly boneless, and of absurd proportions.

Such a design is the flat negation of the principles that for a century and more had inspired Florentine Art. Florentine Art was like Greek Art, an art of Form in Line. With this design we have reached a point whence Form in Line has almost disappeared; whence over desert and marsh and stagnant pool we can dimly descry the banners of another school—a school which strives for form not in line, but in light and shade and colour.

END OF VOL. I.









